AN APOLOGY FOR RUSHWORTH'S DIALOGUES.

WHERIN Mason

The Exceptions of the Lords FALKLAND and DIGBY are answer'd:

AND

The *Arts* of their commended DAILLÉ *Discover'd.*

By THO. WHITE, Gent.

Psal. 63. 8.
Sagittæ Parvulorum factæ sunt plagæ eorum.

A Paris,
Chez Jean Billain Rue St. Jacques a l'enseign
St. Augustin. 1654. 2. 5. 6

AN APOLOGY FOR RUSHWORTH'S DIALOGUES.

WHEREIN

The Exceptions of the Lords FALKLAND and DIGBY are answered:

AND

The *Arts* of their commended DAILLÉ *Discovered.*

By THO. WHITE, Gent.

Vol. 6. 8.

Sagitta Parthenia falle sunt plagæ cœnum.

A Paris,

Chez Jean Millot, Rue Saint-Jacques a l'ensign St. Augustin. 1654.

TO
His ever Honoured Coſen
Mr. ANDREW WHITE,
of the Houſe of
THUNDERSLEY.

Honour'd Coſen,

THough Kindred, Education, and known love all conſpire to make me obnoxious to any good Counſel you pleaſe to give me; yet the averſneſs I have from anſwering Books, permitted me not in our laſt interview to promiſe obedience to your directions. But, ſince that happines of ſeeing you, an unanimous conſent of other friends has made me more ſteadily reflect on what you deſir'd; and conſidering beſides, that the Doctrine of Ruſhworth's Dialogues

takes a path not much beaten by our modern Controvertiſts, I reſolv'd to imitate the example of the penitent Son, who, after denial, perform'd his Fathers commands. Behold then, here, the brood hatcht and brought forth by your advice: pray heaven it prove worthy your acknowledging! which I ſay, not, to engage you in the patronage of what I deliver, farther then truth ſhal convince your judgment; or to make the World imagin theſe Conceptions may find ſhelter in your breaſt: No, I am as cruel to my writings, as the Oſtridge to her Eggs: when once they are laid, let nature play her part to foſter or ſmother the Chickens, as ſhe pleaſes. Let truth commend or condemn my ſayings. He that is ready to renounce falſity, and acknowledge his weaknes, is ſtronger then envy, and beyond the ſhot of malice. Neither have I occaſion to ſuſpect any imputation ſhould fall upon you for this publiſhing my Preſent to you, as I fear it happen'd to another friend: For, I apprehend, I may have written here ſome Periods, which none wil expect ſhould be approved by you; Only, who underſtands

the amplitude of your ſoule, may know, it is able to harbour with indifferency what is ſpoken againſt your own ſenſe and conſent; it being the gift and task of a wiſe man, Imperare liberis. *What I have perform'd, wherin fail'd, is your part to judg; for my ſelf, I can profeſs I deſire not to irritate the meaneſt perſon, nor ſeek I the glory of oppugning the Greateſt: my aym is, to open and eſtabliſh truth; Frivolous and by-queſtions I have on ſet purpoſe avoided. Whether all objections of moment are anſwered, as I cannot affirm, ſo I can proteſt I am no more conſcious of declining any, then of diſſembling, when I write my ſelf*

Your affectionate Coſen

Paris, *Sept.* 21. 1652.

and humble ſervant,

THO. WHITE.

A Second DEDICATION to the ſame Perſon.

Learned, and by me ever to be honour'd Coſen!

'TIs ſo long ſince the former Addreſs to you was written, that no wonder it ſhould now be aſham'd to come abroad without ſome excuſe to juſtify the ſlowneſs of its pace; which is no other, then a ſimple proteſt, that it has not ſtuck in my hands for at leaſt a whol yeer and an half. Upon theſe few words I could ſit down and confidently promiſe my ſelf your pardon; But emergent imputations force me to a larger Apology: The expedition in ſome other late Works of mine rendring the ſeeming neglect of *this* more obnoxious to exception; as if I were rather ambitious to diſplay the errors of ſome of our own ſide, then the enormities of profeſſed Enemies; and your ſelf are conceiv'd to have a part in this ſuſpition.

Now, ſince, from that long and conſtant commerce you have ſtil maintain'd with true Vertue & Learning, I cannot but expect a great rationality and amplitude in your Soul, even to bear with the defectuouſnes of others, as far as you ſee they govern themſelvs by that meaſure of underſtanding which God affords them, I find my ſelf oblig'd to give you the beſt account I can of my proceedings, which I doubt not wil prove ſo much an eaſier task, as you, with whom I am to deal, are of a higher ſtrain, then our trivial diſcourſers; for, as I think, thoſe who ſet up their reſt, that there is no ſcience to be attain'd by ſtudy, are pardonable, if they chuſe opinions by pretence of devotion or reality of intereſt: So I give my cauſe for loſt, if *they* be my Judges. But I hope the great fire of truth, which firſt kindled in my young breaſt a glowing of it, and an earneſtnes of ſeeking it in St. *Thomas* his way, has not been by length of time as much quench'd in you, as quickn'd in me; and therfore with a ful confidence I repreſent my Caſe to you, not doubting but the evidence I produce wil juſtifie, if not the action it ſelf, at leaſt the neceſſity I have to act as long as the preſent perſwaſion is not forc'd from me.

To come then to my Plea; If St. *Peter* commands

mands us *to be ready to give ſatisfaction to all that ſhall ask it, concerning the hope that is in us*, by which is meant our belief, the baſis and firm ſupport of our hope; If the deſign of all that meddle with this ſort of ſtudy ſhould chiefly aim to ſhew, that the doctrins of Chriſtianity are conformable to reaſon, and ſuch as a prudent Perſon, though alſo learned, may imbrace, without prejudice either to his diſcretion, or knowledge: If the ſuggeſting to our firſt parents, that God ſought to govern them like fools, without the leaſt diſcernment betwixt good or evil, be the greateſt and unworthieſt calumny Satan himſelf could invent to charge upon the Almighty: If it be the baſeſt condition that can befal a rational Eſſence, and the moſt contrary both to God and man, whoſe natures conſiſt in knowing and reaſoning; what can I conclude, but that ſuch Teachers, as, for ignorance or intereſt, obſtinately reſolve (in treating with thoſe who are out of the Church) to maintain opinions, whereof no account can be made, either out of Antiquity or Reaſon, are unworthy the function they profeſs, and highly obſtructive to the progreſs of the Catholik faith?

You, who have looked into the large Volumes of Controvertiſts on both ſides, cannot but know they are petty queſtions, and the im-

impugnances of private opinions, that ſwel thoſe vaſt Tomes into ſuch an unweldy and intolerable bulk; I'm ſure not only I, but divers of my friends have had experience, that thoſe very opinions (for oppoſing which, I am exclaimd againſt) have been the retardment of the moſt ingenious and diſintereſſed party of Proteſtants; and that others, who were become Catholiks, out of a pure neceſſity which they ſaw of ſubmitting themſelvs to ſome unerring authority, when they heard their faith declar'd in a rational way, found themſelvs eaſed, as it were, of chains and impriſonment, and tranſlated into a natural ſtate and liberty. I need not preſs, how ulcers in our vitals, are more dangerous then in our outward members; and that we cannot convince others, whilſt our ſelvs are ignorant in the Points we pretend to teach them. No wiſe Captain ſearches the Hoſpitals for *Perdues* & Forcers of breaches. It is a great ſtep towards the reducing others to reaſon, if firſt we make our own thoughts rational. This is my endeavour, this is my fault, for which I am ſo deeply cenſur'd, even by Catholiks.

As for Perſons, my writings neither name nor touch any: and thoſe who make themſelvs pointed at by their forward boaſts of defending the opinions I diſpute againſt, either

ther understand not me or themselves: for, did it deserve the pains, I would undertake to shew out of their printed Writers, that they doe not, with any universality, maintain those tenets I contradict. If in this present Treatise I have in one place descended to more particulars then my course and nature incline me to, I appeal to your own Judgment, whether I do more then follow my Adversary, by replying upon his very words; and therfore your commands ought to be my excuse.

But some think, at least this conjuncture improper to begin this Work, & I wish they could give me a good cause of delay; they should finde me very ready to accept it; But I know no time in which destructive Errors should live unconfuted; our great Master securing us by his example, *neque ad horam cessimus*; nor can your self be ignorant with what fury and violence the opposite opinion strives at this very day to possess the Church of God, and break the eternal Rule of Christian faith. Wherfore, though conscious of my own weaknes, and that, unless God extraordinarily shews his power, my endeavours wil take no place, yet *propter* Sion *non tacebo, & propter* Hierusalem *non quiescam.*

Your most obliged Cosen, and
obedient servant,

29 *March* 1654. T. W.

The Table.

THe *Introduction* page 1

The first Encounter.

Explicating the argument, by which Rushworth *proves the infallibility of* Tradition *p.7*

The second Encounter.

Defeating three Oppositions made against Tradition *p.14*

The third Encounter.

Solving two other Objections against the infallibility of Tradition *p.22*

The fourth Encounter.

That unlearned Catholiks rely on the infallibility of Tradition *p.31*

The fifth Encounter.

That Catholik Divines rely on the same infallibility of Tradition *p.36*

The sixth Encounter.

Disabling three other arguments brought against Tradition *p.44*

The seventh Encounter.

Answering the Greeks and some Divines, *who*

who object new beliefs to the Catholik Church p.50

The eighth Encounter.

That our Lady's immaculate Conception *is not likely to become an Article of Faith* p.64

The ninth Encounter.

Shewing the unanimous agreement of Divines, that all infallibility is from Tradition p.70

The tenth Encounter.

That there was no Tradition *for the errour of the* Chyliasts p.77

The eleventh Encounter.

That there was Tradition *for the* Trinity, *before the Council of* Nice p.84

The twelfth Encounter.

That the necessity of communicating Infants *is no* Tradition, *but prayer to Saints is.* p.99

The thirteenth encounter.

Reflecting on certain considerations, and shewing that there is nothing able to disprove the Church of Romes Communion, to be the sign of the true Church p.107

The fourteenth Encounter.

Four other Arguments revers'd p.113

The fifteenth Encounter.

Declaring the state of this question, Whether the Scripture *can decide Controversies?* p.135

The sixteenth Encounter.

Examining five Texts brought for the sufficiency of Scripture p.150

The

The seventeenth Encounter.

Examining such places as are brought against the admittance of any but Scriptural proof in Religion p.262

The eighteenth Encounter.

Declaring the reasons of the Authors concluding, without proceeding to the examination of the Fathers Testimonies p.173

The first Survey.

Of the Nature and subject of Daille's *book* p.179

The second Survey.

Of the two first Chapters of his first book; wherin he urges, that the Fathers of the three first Ages were few, and their writings wholly unconcerning our Controversies p.188

The third Survey.

Of his third and fourth Chapters; wherin he objects forgery and corruption of the Fathers *works* p.197

The fourth Survey.

Of the fifth Chapter, wherin he objects the Fathers *Eloquence, and that on set purpose they spake obscurely* p.208

The fifth Survey.

Of the six Chapters following, wherin he objects wilful deceit to the Fathers p.216

The

The fixth Survey.

How the Authority of Fathers is infallible p.226

The seventh Survey.

Of the four first Chapters of his second Book; wherein he pretends, The Fathers gave wrong notions of the Faith of the Church; and that they spake not like Judges. 232

The eighth Survey.

Of the two last Chapters of his second Book; wherein he says, many Fathers have agreed in the same Errors; and objects certain varieties between the ancient and modern Church p.238

The ninth Survey.

In answer to two Questions, in his last Chapter: One, the Fathers being rejected, to what Judge we ought to recur? The other, What use is to be made of the Fathers? p.250

AD

ADVERTISMENT.

THe Reader is desired to take notice, that this Apology particularly relates to the last Edition of Rushworth's Dialogues (in 8° of the Long-Primer-Letter 1654, as which alone has felt throughout this Authors last hand) and principally undertakes the refutation of Lucius Lo. Falkland's Discours of Infallibility, and George Lo. Digby (now Earl of Briſtow) his printed Letters to Sir Ken. Digby; which he performs in a ſtile modeſt and reſpective, anſwerable to the dignity of their Perſons, and civility of their Writings.

The Animadverſions upon Daillé are apply'd to the Engliſh Tranſlation by T. S. not to the French Original; wherin the Reader wil eaſily pardon thoſe uncourteous expreſſions he ſhal meet with, if he conſider how little favour he deſerves from his equals, that inſolently condemns his Betters; nay perhaps approve the juſtice of ſo neceſſary a reſentment; ſince 'twere unreaſonable in him to pretend the leaſt regard from his Cotemporaries, that has compos'd ſo infamous and injurious a Libel againſt all Antiquity.

ER-

ERRATA.

PAge 13.l.1.since *in* Const. p.27.l.13. *Eight's*, p.58. l.20. *which* were.p.78. l. 10. *handing* p.82. l.16. to *our* ears.p.102. l.7. *reatus*, & l.17. is *there*. p.106.l.2. be *not*. & l.28. but *by* their. p.119. l.2. *expoſes*. p.127. l.3. evident *they* cannot.p.128.l.5. part, *that is*, the- p.137, l.10 *the* venom. p.142.l. *laſt*, attempt *the* other.p.143. l.1,2, dele (but out of Scr. nor yet in that doc they uſe ſo fair play) p.148. *Parentheſis begins at* (this,l.10. *and ends at* being)l,13.p.152. l.2. *vivifying*, & l.25. *in* the firſt.p.174.l. *laſt*, day, *as* com--- p.179.l.7. *with*. p. 193.l.2. *ſo* few.p.237.l.28. not *bound*, p.238.l.19. certain *varieties*, p.245.p.243.l.23. dele *of*, l.7. in *his*. p. 248.l. *laſt*, ſhal *not* in.

An

AN APOLOGY FOR TRADITION.

The Introduction.

THus it will ſometimes happen; that events of greateſt importance take their riſe from ſmal occaſions. The *Controverſy*, this following *Treatiſe* undertakes, began in a ſlight familiar conference betwixt two intimate friends and *kinſmen*, as it were only for exerciſe to train themſelvs, and practice their poſtures: but ſince by the entrance of new *Allies* is become of ſo high concernment, that what at firſt was a private voluntary *skirmiſh*, ſeems now to ſpread it ſelfe into a publique and ſolemn

War. Nor need I ſtrain much to make good the *phraſe*, ſince the *eminent Names*, on the one ſide, and the great advantage of ground on the other, may juſtly be admitted to ſupply the number of an *Army* in both.

And, becauſe I deſire to prepare my ſelf with the fitteſt proportion I could for the *aſſaults* of my Adverſaries, I have declin'd the Sword and Buckler, and taken up a ſingle Rapier; chang'd the antique weapons of *Dialogue*, (though, in my opinion, they want neither ornament nor particular efficacy) into the modern *mode* of direct diſcourſe: Wherein, as I confeſſe, *Their* guilded *Armour* ſhines more, and dazles the ey; ſo I fear not, when we come to charge, our courſer ſteel wil prove ſubſtantial and impenetrable. However I ſhall not ſpend much time in *parley*; but after a ſhort relation how I come to be drawn into the quarrel, and by what method I intend to carry it on, I ſhall immediately advance to a cloſe *encounter.*

Before thoſe *Dialogues* (wherein that original private conference is at larg delivered) were brought to light, or (as I think) fully conceiv'd in the Authors brain; an
Sr.K.D. honoured friend, and Patron of mine had couch'd ſome ſmal, but quinteſſential part of their doctrin in a little pithy Preſent to

a new-converted Lady; and having cited it afterward for brevity ſake, in a controverſial Epiſtle to an eminent Friend, engag'd it therby into an almoſt fatal combat; nothing but truth being able to reſcue it from ſo potent an enemy. *L. Digby.*

Beſides, a deceaſed friend of mine having oblig'd me to declare my opinion concerning a witty diſcourſe made by one of his acquaintance, extorted from me an unlick'd *Mola*, repreſenting ſuddenly and imperfectly, my judgement in reference to that Authors work. This again, ſtirring the ſame humours, drew the doctrin into an eminent danger of encountring oppoſition. Nevertheleſſe, God ſo ordering it, many years paſt, in calm and happy daies of peace, the two Adverſaries (whom theſe occaſions had provoked) not publiſhing their Labours, as things below their perſons; till all-diſcovering time (as I believe) againſt the Authors intentions, brought them both to light, and, by conſequence, an imputation on thoſe *Dialogues*, and a neceſſity on me to diſ-engage the honour of their Compoſer. *L. Falkl.*

In order to which, my intention is not to reply minutely to either of the Opponents works; muchles to handle any by-queſtions: but only to chuſe out of them, or any others, what I conceive may poſſibly be

thought as yet unanſwer'd, and conſequently capable of prejudicing thoſe *Dialogues*.

By this reſerv'd and moderate temper, I hope to free my ſelf from all ſuch incivilities as neceſſarily attend on the undertaking to convince a particular perſon of weakneſs or inconſequence in his diſcours, from which kind of captious proceedings, beſides my Reaſon, I am beholding to my Nature for its extream averſnes. Beſides, in anſwering a writing, many impertinent quarrels are pick'd, the ſubſtantial controverſie loſt or confounded, and the Truth it ſelf, by multiplicity, left more obſcure then when the diſputant began: for, where many queſtions are ſtarted and none deeply ſearched into, the Reader goes away without any reſolution, more then what himſelf brought along with him. I intend therefore with all candor and fidelity, to ſelect ſuch objections as I think really intereſt the Controverſie; and handle them without relation to Books or diſtinction of Authors, or citations of places: as one who ſeeks Truth, not the glory of confuting or vanity of anſwering.

But ſome may be unſatisfied with my proceedings, and demand, if this be my intention, why do I cite *thoſe Authors* in particular; and, as it were, make a ſhew of anſwering, without any effect: I deſire thoſe to conſider,

conſider, that the *names* of Author's carry weight, among two ſorts of Readers; One, ſuch as diligently peruſe the books written on both ſides; to whom I offer this ſatiſfaction, that they may find the ſolution to any difficulty which occurs concerning this ſubject, in their writings: The other, ſuch who look no farther then the Title page, or whether a book be anſwer'd or no, are inſolent upon the writers name, and importunely clamorous, that 'tis a Piece beyond all poſſibility of reply, be it never ſo weak and trivial; to whom the ſimple profeſſion that *'tis anſwered*, is a wedg fit for their knot.

I muſt confeſſe, next to the aſſuredneſſe of my Cauſe, 'tis my chiefeſt comfort to deal with *Perſons* of ſuch *quality*: ſuch as the Proteſtant party never produced before: it ſeems to have choſen them to live by, or die with. Two, whoſe Merits found the way of honouring their Deſcents, by their generoſity; whoſe eloquence none were found to exceed, whoſe wits none wil be found to equal. What erudition in *Languages*, or acutenes in *Logick* could furniſh, was treaſur'd in their breaſts: But above all, a comprehenſive judgement, in managing the numerous and weighty affairs of a *Kingdom* to the very heightning that ſublime and ſubtleſt

ſubtleſt Office, (*Secretary of State*) which *they* both, ſucceſſively, exalted to ſuch a pitch, that it muſt expect a fall in whoever ſhall ſucceed them.

One is, the right honourable *George Lord Digby* (now Earl of *Briſtol*) ever mounting the ſcale of Honour to a degree ſo far above the reach of others, that 'tis even beyond their ſight: The other, *Lucius Lord Falkland*, who crown'd his deſerved *Laurell* with a wreath of Oaken *Scyons*; dying in ſuch a poſture, as if miſchief could not have ravag'd *England*, had it not made its paſſage through the breſt of that Martyr of Peace. I can accuſe him of nothing, but that he left this Book behind him; it being too plain what unhappy impreſſion it maks in his Friends, ſince my ſelf, almoſt a ſtranger, cannot read thoſe quaint and gentile expreſſions, thoſe rarities of wit, thoſe coruſcations of *Greek* and *Latine* remarques, and (which moſt of all ſurprizes my admiration) thoſe Noble ſweetneſſes and civilities ſo unexpected in a quarrelling Treatiſe; but I feel in my heart an unuſual ſorrow and regret, that our thoughts cannot ſtay on him, without the ſad check of a *ſuit*.

But, ſince we are out of hope to reſuſcitate him that's gon, like the day he died on; let us (by *Davids* example) leave theſe flattering

tering weakneſſes of nature, and ſeek ſevere reaſon in the controverſy we pretend to manage.

THE FIRST ENCOUNTER,

Explicating the Argument, by which RUSHWORTH *proves the Infallibility of Tradition.*

THe Dialogues (in whoſe defence we now appear, as Second) govern their diſcourſe by this fair method: Firſt, they treat and ſettle theſe definitions; *Tradition we call, the delivery of Chriſts doctrin from hand to hand, in that part of the world which, with propriety, is call'd Chriſtian:* By *Chriſts doctrine*, we mean *that* which was *generally* preach'd by the *Apoſtles*, and contains *all* ſuch points as are *neceſſary* to the ſalvation of the *World*; not only in particular, to *ſingle* perſons, but for *government* of the *Church*, and bringing *multitudes*, with *convenience*, to perfection in this life, and felicity in the next. Which being eſtabliſht, they immediately proceed to this general Poſition, that *All Chriſt taught, or the Holy Ghoſt ſuggeſted to the Apoſtles, of this nature,*

is

is, by a direct uninterrupted line, entirely and fully descended to the present Church, which communicates with, and acknowledges subjection to the Roman: Adding also the convers of that proposition, *viz.* Nothing is so descended, but *such Truths*; nor any thing held by this tenure, but what is *so* descended; which being cast up, amounts to this great Conclusion, *No errour was ever, or can be embraced by the Church, in quality of a matter of faith.*

The proof consists in this: Since 'tis confessed the Catholik Church goes upon this Maxim, that *Her Doctrine is received from Christ, and still handed along to the present generation*; they who cavil at this assertion, should assign some Age when they conceive an errour crept in; and the maintainer should prove it enter'd not in *that Age*, Because *that* Age held nothing was to be admitted, as of Faith, except what was deliver'd to it by the former: but the Objectors themselves say, this supposed errour was not deliver'd by the former, since they put it to be, now, first, believ'd; therfore the Age in which they imagin this errour crept in, could not be the first that believ'd it.

And, lest some might reply, though the *present Roman Church* stands now upon the proposed maxim, yet anciently it did not; the same argument may be thus reiterated,

If

If this principle which now governs the Church had not always done ſo, it muſt have been introduced in ſome Age ſince the Apoſtles: name therfore the Age, and immediatly 'tis urged, either the Church had aſſurance, in that Age, all ſhe held was deſcended lineally, as we ſpake, from the Apoſtles, or not: If ſo, then queſtionleſs ſhe held her doctrin upon that maxim; For it is the only undoubted and *ſelf-evident* principle: If not, then ſhe wilfully belyed her ſelf, and conſpired to damn all her poſterity, voluntarily taking up this new Rule of faith and commanding it to be accepted by all the world, as the neceſſary doctrin of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, deſcended upon the preſent age by univerſal Tradition from their Anceſtors, and for ſuch to be deliver'd to their children; and all this againſt the expreſs evidence of her own conſcience. Thus far reaches the argument.

He that ſhall compare this perpetuation of the *Church*, with the conſtancy of propagating mankind; and proportion the love of happineſs and natural inclination to *truth*, (which is in the ſuperiour part of mankind, and commands powerfully in it) to the material appetite of procuring *corporal* ſucceſſion, and weigh what accidents are able and neceſſary to interrupt the progreſs of

of one and the other, will find the propagation of *Religion* far ſtronger and leſs defectible, then *that* of *mankind*; ſuppoſing them once rooted alike in univerſality and ſetledneſs. Since therfore the means of conducting nature to its true and chief end, *Felicity*, are more principally intended, then thoſe by which it is ſimply preſerv'd in *being*; this Contemplator will clearly diſcern, that if humane nature continue to the laſt and dreadful day, this ſucceſſion alſo of a *true Church* muſt be carried on through the ſame extent of time: there appearing indeed no purpoſe why the world ſhould endure a minute longer, if this once come to fail; that part of mankind, which arrives to bliſs, being the end why the reſt was made, as mankind is the end for which all the other material Creatures are ſet on work.

Again, if a rational diſcourſer ſhould plot in his head how, with condeſcendence to the weakneſs of our nature, he might bring mankind to bliſs; and, to this end, plant in it a perpetual and conſtant knowledg of the true and ſtraight way thither; & did obſerve that Man in his immature age is naturally ſubject to believe, and after his ful growth, tenacious of what he had ſuck'd in with his milk: could he chuſe but ſee, that to make the *Mothers* flatter

into their *Children* the first elements of the acquisition of Beatitude, and continually go on nursing them up in the maxims of piety, till their stronger years gave a steddy setledness to their minds; must needs be the most sweet and connatural way that can be imagin'd, to beget a firm and undoubted assent to those happy principles.

If he think on, and chance to light on this truth, that the greatest part of mankind, some through dulness of understanding, some by the distractions of seeking necessaries for their subsistence, or at least conveniences for their accommodation, and others for the diffluence of nature to Pleasures and Vanities, are, to their very departing hour, wholly incapable of searching out their *Religion*, either by their own contemplation or the learned books of others: I cannot doubt but such a considerer would without the least difficulty or hesitation, conclude that, were it his design to set up a Religion, which he would have constantly and universally propagated, he must of necessity pitch upon this way; And so, with a resolute and pious confidence pronounce, if God has not already taken this course, certainly he should have done it.

To these considerations give my pen leave to add the confession of our Adversaries, who

who boldly acknowledge the *Roman Church* has had univerſal Tradition for the whole body of its faith ever ſince St. *Gregories* days; which is now a thouſand years, and very near two parts of the three that Chriſtian Religion has endured. They confeſs thoſe Doctrins, which are common to us and them, remain in our Church uncorrupted, and have ſtill deſcended from Father to Son, *by vertue of Tradition*, ſince the very times of the Apoſtles. They will not deny the Ages, betwixt *Conſtantine* and St. *Gregory*, flouriſht with an infinity of Perſons famous both for piety and learning; and the Church never more vigilant, never more jealous, being continually alarm'd by ſuch Troops of powerful and ſubtle Hereticks: ſo that there is no likelihood, groſs errours (ſuch as Idolatry and Superſtition import) could creep in undiſcern'd, in thoſe days. And perhaps, much leſs betwixt *Conſtantine* and the *Apoſtles*; the time being ſo ſhort that it ſcarce exceeds the retroſpection of thoſe who liv'd with *Conſtantine*: At leaſt that age could evidently know what was the faith of Chriſtendom in the age of the Apoſtles great Grand-children, and they again be certainly aſſured of the Doctrin of the Apoſtles diſciples, their Grandfathers. Which is an evidence beyond all teſti-

mony

mony of writers, that ſince *Conſtantines* time it was known by a kind of ſelf-ſight what the Grandchildren of the Apoſtles held, and it could not be doubted of them but they knew and held the doctrin of the *Apoſtles*; that, I ſay, in *Conſtantines* time, the publike doctrin of Chriſtianity was the doctrin of the *Apoſtles*.

Beſides, the communication of Chriſtians being very difficult and infrequent, during thoſe perſecutions; the contagion alſo of hereſies ſcatter'd it ſelf ſlowly among Chriſtians in thoſe times. And here I ſhall note a ridiculous cavil, very common not only in the mouths of the more raſh and ſhallow Proteſtants, but even in the writings of many of their graveſt and moſt ſolemn Doctors, who cry out againſt the *Ignorance* of our Church, as the cauſe of our errors, and yet put the Ages in which they inſult, that *Frigebat Scriptura cum vetuſtis Autoribus*, ſome hundreds of years after the time, wherin they acknowledg the doctrins, term'd errours, were already flouriſhing; as if they could proceed, from a defect which follow'd them: A ſlander ſo palpably abſur'd that all the charity I have can ſcarce perſwade me to think they are not blinded rather with malice then ignorance, that dare vent ſuch groſs contradictions.

And

And now having abridg'd as 'twere, the whole sense of *Rushworths Dialogues* concerning *Tradition*, into this short *compendium*; I will apply my pen to answer what exceptions are taken, against either the forme or matter of that Discourse.

THE SECOND ENCOUNTER,

Defeating three oppositions made against Tradition.

THe first objection against the form is, that I put my Adversary to prove his position instead of going about to maintain my own. This they imagin, because I bid them assign the Age; which they take to be as much as a demand of them to prove that in such a time came in the error: but 'tis a plain mistake. For I do not require they should prove the errour began in such an Age; but only exact of them, for Argument sake, to name the Age in which they find most difficulty for me to conclude, or wherin they conceive the sinnews of my discourse will be most slack and feeble: for the force of the main argument is indifferent

to

to any Age they can pitch upon, equally demonſtrative in all, and ſo, by ſtriking at every one, concludes againſt all. This I ſay not, any way to diſclaim the advantage we Catholicks have, whilſt we preſs our adverſary to prove his *Theſis*, being no leſs a juſt then ſtrong and ſecure retreat; and which I reſerve my ſelf the liberty of retiring to, perhaps, at another time: but now I only urge him to name one Age at hazzard, meerly to give way to the proſecution of the argument; a Juſtice I might do for my ſelf, if I would, without his courteſie, and have all the laws of diſputation bear me out in it.

It is therefore to litle purpoſe to demand, whether I ask of the firſt man that held ſuch an opinion, or when it came to be univerſal (though the queſtion be plainly of this later, for we hold it was ever ſo;) nor is there any art neceſſary to anſwer it, the argument made being indifferent to all. The skill therefore required, is only to know what belongs to the form of demonſtrating; for the moſt part, indeed, not found in the quaint diſcourſes of Rhetoricians. But the Adverſary thinks, when the Queſtion is put concerning a Doctrine's being *Univerſal*, it muſt ſuppoſe none to hold the contrary opinion; as if we could not know what is

the

the publick Faith of *France*, because perhaps a few conceal'd persons may believe somwhat different. Wherin, he reflects not, that *Heresie* signifies the cleaving to a private opinion: so that, when there were any such in former ages, that very thing made them *Hereticks* (how good wits or great learning so ever they had) if they dissented from the doctrine deliver'd by their forefathers. He presses, Catholiks cannot tell when the communicating of Children began, since St. *Austin* thinks it an Apostolical Tradition. We answer, we are of that mind too: but with this qualification, that it was a Tradition begun by some Apostles, not all, in some Countries, not all, in some circumstances, not all: And therfore 'twas neither superstition to use it, nor sacriledg to leave it off; how strongly soever the opponent avers one of these two to be unavoydable.

The second oppofition made against the form is, that 'tis a fallacy of that kind, called *Soritæ*, in which the *Scepticks* found so great difficulty, that they used to press them against the *Stoicks* and other dogmatists, as insoluble and manifestly demonstrating there was no science. But, to understand the meaning of this objection, the demonstration propos'd is to begin from the Apostles time: and so it must be suppo-

sed

ſed, that the next Age after the Apoſtles, in any controverſy againſt new doctrins, examin'd no farther then on which ſide ſtood the verdict of the Apoſtles, wherof they could not be ignorant. The Argument therfore preſſed that the next (that is, the third Age) muſt of neceſſity take the ſame method againſt its Novellifts, convincing them of falſity, becauſe their doctrine was contrary to *that* of thoſe who had heard the Diſciples of the Apoſtles ſpeak. And ſo, ſince the Tradition of Faith was convey'd from age to age, ſtil with this caution, that the latter was to believe ſuch a doctrin, becauſe receiv'd from the former, upon this warrant that it deſcended lineally from Chriſt in the ſame manner, to them, as they deliver'd it to their poſterity; it neceſſarily follows, that this doctrin could not but continue pure even to our preſent time: unleſs ſome age ſhould prevaricate all bounds of truth and nature, and deliver ſomthing to the following age, as traditionally deriv'd from Chriſt, which had not been ſo receiv'd.

This argument, ſo propoſ'd (though I know not whether ſo underſtood) ſeem'd to the opponent like the ratiocination of one Mr. *Tbinn*, a melancholy Philoſopher, who perſwaded himſelf, a perſon might be found

that could leap from off *Pauls* (for ſure he needed a high ſtanding) to *Rome*, becauſe 'twas poſſible ſome man might leap full twenty foot, and no doubt but another ſomwhat more, and ſtill another more then he, and ſo without end; therfore among all, one quick ſpringer would be found, who could make his jump from hence to the *Capitol*.

But certainly he that weigh'd the two arguments, might without extraordinary ſtudy, have found there was ſome difference in their form: Mr. *Thinn*, being oblig'd to take variety of men undetermined: but this argument engaging only ſixteen ages, and peradventure, not needing above ſix, or in rigour, ſome three, and thoſe ſuch as have had a real exiſtence, wheras the Worlds durance and latitude are not ſufficient to find men enough to juſtify Mr. *Thinns* Proces. This I ſay was obvious enough to any mean underſtanding, not preoccupated with prejudice againſt the concluſion. But one, who had underſtood how *Ariſtotle* unwrapped *Zeno's* fallacies, might eaſily have known that Infinity it ſelf could not add more then one full foot to Mr. *Thinns* leapers: if the encreaſe were made by ſub-proportional parts, wherof the firſt was one half foot; and if by equal quantities, as Feet

or

or Inches, he would ſoon come to an end of his addition, unleſſe he put mens ſtrength and nimbleneſſe to be infinite. But to fit Judge of Religion, of eternal bliſs and damnation, ſome curious and unhappy wits dare think requires neither ſo much indifferency nor reflection as the compoſition of quantity.

Yet I cannot but admire it could ſcape a piercing ey to diſcern, that as the conſequent of Mr. *Thinns* diſcourſe is ridiculous and impoſſible, ſo *that* of the propoſed demonſtration is evident and undeniable. For what ingenuous forehead will deny, but ſuch verities as all the world allows to remain ſtill untainted in the Church of *Rome*, have deſcended by this traditionary way to us from Chriſt? Wherfore both the poſſibility and actuality of this way is not only acknowledg'd by the unanimous confeſſion of all parties, but its force and efficacy made evident by the downright violence of reaſon: all the controverſie being meerly about the multitude and ſufficiency of the things receiv'd, not the impotency of the means to convey them to us.

But, to make an end of this petty Queſtion, I appeal to all Maſters, nay even Scholars in Geometry, whether this form of arguing be not the ſame that *Euclid*, *Archi-*

medes and *Apollonius* uſe in their ſevereſt demonſtrations? As when *Euclid* undertakes to demonſtrate this plain and elementary *Theoreme*, that *No Circle can touch another in more then one point*; himſelf acts the part of the Denier, and according to the law of Mathematicks, ſuppoſes at random the other point, to ſee whether the Propoſition be maintainable: and if the *Contactus* in the point aſſign'd be proved impoſſible, by an argument applyable to any other that can be offered, the *Theoreme* remains infallibly demonſtrated, and the Rules of that preciſe and ſtrict Science perfectly comply'd with.

The third oppoſition is drawn out of a conceited impoſſibility of the caſe; and ſo they demand how can it come to paſſe that all the Doctors of one age ſhould meet together, to inſtruct the world of Scholars that are to ſucceed them in the next? an action, if not impoſſible, at leaſt ſo incredible, as by no means to be aver'd without legitimate Authority, which they ſay, is wanting. And further, ſhould we undertake, that not only all Doctors, but all men of one age met with the men of the next, to teach them; it were an enterprize ſo highly impoſſible, as not to be thought on even among the wildeſt capriches of a Romance:

mance: yet to ſo hard ſtraits are we driven, that we muſt defend the poſſibility of this later aſſertion.

Which to compaſſe, we diſtinguiſh this word, *Together*, as capable of ſignifying an *unity* either in *place* or *time*: and, if the Opponent mean one Age cannot meet another in a *Town* or great *Hall*, as *Councils* uſe, I am eaſily perſwaded ſuch interviews are impoſſible; but if this Aſſembly needs only the unity of time, I think it will require but a moderate ſtock of faith to believe, either that men of the ſame Age live together in that Age, or that Fathers meet with their Children. If then we put all Fathers and Mothers, all Paſtors and Teachers to make one Age, and all Children and young perſons, who come to be inſtructed, and afterward outlive their Tutors, to compoſe the other age; I ſee no great impoſſibility in this poſition, but a clear one in the contrary. For, I cannot believe the Opponents think, men, ſince Chriſts time, ſtart out of mole-hils with clods on their heads, as it ſeems *Empedocles* and *Horace* imagined, and the *Toſcans* of their wiſe *Tages*, high Maſter of their skill in *Augury*.

And this anſwer cuts off another difficulty, urg'd by certain Speculatiſts, that, becauſe, in ſome rude times, they imagine the learned

learned were few, and therfore ſubject to corruption by hopes or fears, they might more eaſily be prevail'd with to proclaim a falſ *Tenet* in that Age; whence, this claim of infalſibility would remain broken: But the former anſwer ſaves it; for ſince neither the great multitude of Inſtructors, nor inſtructed perſons can meet in any other aſſembly then that of the whole and open World, all poſſibility of corruption is evidently avoided.

THE THIRD ENCOUNTER,

Solving two other Objections againſt the infallibility of Tradition.

THe fourth oppoſition denys the neceſſity of aſſigning any Age wherein an errour may be ſaid to have crept in; becauſe (ſay they) an errour might begin firſt in one Country, and inſenſibly ſteal over into another, without any notice taken of its novelty, ſo that there is no time wherin its beginning is diſcoverable: For proof, they inſtance in ſome errour held by divers Hereticks in divers ages; and tell you, the beſt Hiſtorian

Hiſtorian knows who was firſt mentioned to have broacht that errour: wheras perhaps a leſs diligent or careleſs Writer may cite ſome middle or late Author, attributing to him the original invention of that opinion.

To this we reply, 'tis too deſperate an Anſwer to call a hundred years an inſenſible time, to ſuppoſe all the Paſtors ſtupify'd, and the Doctors aſleep for a whole century together. At leaſt, let us ask this fair queſtion, Was there no Doctor or Biſhop made it his buſineſs to promote that new opinion within a hundred years? If you ſay, no; how could an innovation of any conſiderable importance get footing which had no eminent patron? If you ſay yes; ſee whether that was not the occaſion of impugning all hereſies, when extraordinary perſons divulged them: I, but you'l ſay, it was ſo tranſcendent a Doctor that he overtopt all. Here, I confeſs my weakneſs: for if ſome ſky-faln Angel, indeed, ſhould come, with tongue and pen more then humane, I doubt not but he might perhaps endanger a great part of the Church: but, if we make our compariſon only betwixt men; who ever had the like reputation in the Greek Church, as *Origen*? yet he was condemned by the ſame Church. Who was more elo-

quent

quent then *Eusebius Cæsarienſis?* more cunning then *Euſebius Nicomedienſis?* more ſubtle then *Arius?* Let us add a faction ſo powerful, as to make ten Councils, to number three hundred Biſhops; yet, notwithſtanding all this, the *Arians* were condemned. The *Dragon* drew but a *third part* of the Stars; and the Apoſtle has armd us, even againſt the treachery of Angels; charging that, in ſpight of them, we cleave faſt to what we have receiv'd, to what was Preach'd to us, that is, to *Tradition*: For rely but on what, in memory of our own age, the Church has univerſally held, and deliver'd, as from Chriſt, and no ſubtlety of men or Angels can make you miſtake.

Yet, Let it be ſuppoſed, ſome unparallel'd Brain had the power to make a doctrin univerſal; could this ſtand with the ſtill way of creeping in inſenſibly? Is not this poſition, that a Doctor was ſo great, & took ſo much pains to divulge his opinion, wrote ſo many Books in defence of it, that he overcame all oppoſers, and at laſt made it univerſal; and yet all this while the new doctrin ſtole in unawares, the Paſtors of the Church never dreaming any ſuch thing: is not this as very a Bull as to ſay, an Army ſhot off all their Attillery, that the Enemy might not diſcover where they lay? or to do, as is reported

ported of an acquaintance of mine, who being in good company, to ride through a Town, where he was afraid to be taken notice of, at his entrance ſet ſpurs to his horſe, holding his Cane ſtraight before him, and Trumpeted *Tararara Tararara* the whole length of the Town? Nevertheleſs, ſince 'tis for our ſide (ſays the *Zelot*) 'tis an invincible demonſtration.

But we deſire leave to conſider one point farther; In what times came in the errours, our Adverſaries ſo loudly complain of? ſee whether they be not thoſe ages when there were great quarrels about innovations encroaching on the Church, and multitudes of exceptions taken: ſo that, had any ſide entertain'd a new errour, not common to both parties, eſpecially if the novelties were any way notable, they could not have been paſſ'd over without mutual contradictions or upbraidings. The doctrines therfore which in thoſe times paſs'd unreprehended, and were currantly admitted among all parties, as being common to them all, without queſtion were not *Errata, ſed Tradita.* Whence, certainly it muſt needs appear a manifeſt folly, to think any errour could run through the Church ſo uncontrol'd, as to gain, without the leaſt ſign of oppoſition, an univerſality: and much like

the

the ſtory, that the great *Turk*, with an Army of three or four hundred thouſand men, ſhould ſteal upon *Germany* by night and take all the good fellows ſo faſt aſleep that not a man ſhould eſcape, nor ſo much as a Gooſ *gaggle* to wake the drowſy neighbours, and, having thus ſilently run over the Empire, ſhould paſs into *France*; and thence into *Spain*, and ſtill catch them all napping without the leaſt notice or reſiſtance: wherof, if any ſlow and dull heart ſhould doubt, as ſeeming indeed ſomwhat an improbable ſtory, the reporter ſhould immediatly prove all with a *why not?* ſince the Greeks had ſurpriz'd *Troy* ſo; and perhaps ſome other great Captain one ſingle Town or *Garriſon*.

Beſides, if we venture to throw away a little faith on ſo extravagant a fable; the action will ſtill remain unpoſſible to be conceal'd. Who ſhall hinder the Conqueror from proclaiming ſuch unparalleld victories, to applaud himſelf and terrifie the reſt of the world? who can forbid his ſouldiers to Chronicle their own valours, and everywhere boaſt ſuch un-heard of exploits? Certainly, were there no Catholick teſtimonies of theſe late unhappy diviſions from the Church, yet would ſucceeding ages find evidence enough (as to the matter of fact)

even

even in the writings of the Reformers themſelvs. How often do their Books inſult o're the blindneſs of their Predeceſſors, and triumph in the man of God *Martin Luther*, and the quicker light *Jo. Calvin*, as firſt diſcoverers of their new-found Goſpel? can we think it poſſible diſtracted *Europe* ſhould blot out of her memory the ſad effects of ſchiſm and hereſy, before the tears they have cauſ'd be wiped from her eys? for my part, I am confident our once happy Iſland will never forget the graceleſs diſorders of *Henry the eights* unfortunate intemperance, though there were not one Engliſh Catholick left in the world, to remember them by the ſmart he endures ever ſince.

Add to all this, the points, wherin *Proteſtants* accuſe us, are the moſt palpably abſurd poſitions that can fall into a Chriſtians head; as, making Gods of Saints or Statues, which were the dotages of the baſeſt ſort of Pagans.

Nor is the example of errours often ſprung and often quell'd again, of any advantage to the Opponent. For our queſtion concerns opinions remaining till this day, and by himſelf, ſuppoſed to have gaind the maſtery of the Church, and never fail'd ſince their beginning: becauſe all doctrins, which appear to have a *being* before any age

the

the Adversary can name, are thereby evidently proved perpetual Traditions; especially when the Authors were such as lived in Communion with the Catholik Church then extant, and remain'd in veneration with the Church succeeding.

Me thinks also since the opposer maintains it was more then a whole Age in working it self up to this universality, if the errour were gross, it must without doubt have been a long time in one Country, before it passed into another; else we shall scarce find a reason why it became not general in a shorter period of years; and so it would easily appear, until such an age that new doctrin was never heard of: and in every Country the beginnings would be mentioned by the Historians and other writers: as, who came out of *Greece* into *France* to plant *Images*, who first introduced the *Priests* power of *absolution*, who invented the doctrine of preferring the *judgment* of the *Church* before our own *private* interpretation of *Scripture*; all which we see exactly perform'd against every considerable *Heresy*, a minute and punctual account being still *upon Record*, who were the original contrivers, who the principal abettors, where they found patronage, where opposition, How long they lived, and when they died.

To

To evade this reaſon, is fram'd the next crimination, by ſaying what is anſwer'd has its probability, if the errours laid to our charge were *contrary* to Chriſtian doctrine: But they only pretend to accuſe us of *Superfœtations*, or falſe and defective additions to the Faith firſt planted; which excreſcencies, only, the Reformers ſeek to take away. And, though it be manifeſt, when they come to charge us in particular, they inſtance in doctrines *ſubſtantially* oppoſite to the Faith of Chriſt, as *Superſtition* and *Idolatry*, could their calumnies be juſtify'd againſt us: yet, becauſe this objection civilly renounces ſuch harſh and uncharitable language, let us ſee what may be intended by *Superfœtations*.

Either the diſliked additions are of *truths*, or of *falſities*. If, of *truths*, we expect they would demonſtrate who has forbidden us to learn and advance our knowledg in Chriſtian Religion, or matters belonging to it. Did God give his *Law* to Beaſts, that have no diſcourſe nor capacity, by joyning two *revealed* truths to arrive at the diſcovery of a third? Again, where is it prohibited for the Doctour and Preacher to know more then the Ideot and old wife? What fault then can even the proud and peeviſh humour of this age find in this point? If Hereticks

reticks will raiſe duſt, and obſcure the cleareſt articles of Chriſtian faith, and that ſo maliciouſly, as without ſetling ſome further explication, the people are in danger of being perverted: is it a ſin to eſtabliſh ſuch defences and Ramparts againſt encroaching errours?

If the addition be of *falſities*; let us examin how the Oppoſer knows they are falſe? If he reply, becauſe they are contrary to clear *Scripture*: then they are alſo contrary to that Faith which deliver'd Scripture to be true. If the points be not againſt Scripture; either they croſſe ſome known Article of Faith, or only the Principles of naturall reaſon. If they be purely objects of natural reaſon (though truths) they belong not *ſo* to Religion, as to be accounted *Articles of Faith*: if they contradict ſome other fore-taught Article, then the Argument before explicated (concerning the infallibility of Tradition, and the creeping in of Errours againſt it) returns to its force. If neither of theſe, why are they falſe, or upon what grounds condemned?

But peradventure he excepts not againſt the Truths, but the obligation to believe and profeſs them. Admitting then the additional points to be, in themſelvs, true; why will not the Oppoſer aſſent to them? has

has he a demonſtration againſt them? No, for then they could not be true. Has he ſuch Arguments, that nothing oppoſite is equivalent to their eminent credibility? No; for, ſetting aſide demonſtration, no argument can be comparable to the *Churches Authority*. The reaſon therfore, if the inward thoughts be faithfully ſifted, will at length appeare no other, then the preferring his own Opinion before the judgement of the Church: which being the effect of an obſtinate and malepert pride, makes no legitimate excuſe for not believing.

THE FOURTH ENCOUNTER.

That unlearned Catholiks rely upon the infallibility of Tradition.

THe next exception is of main importance; for it undermines the demonſtration at the very root, denying that the Church of *Rome* relys on Tradition: and having divided the believers into learned and unlearned, firſt undertakes to prove the unlearn'd not to be grounded on Tradition; at leaſt, not for their whole Faith.

For,

For, if a queſtion ariſe never thought on before, and once a Council determine the Controverſie, that decree is accepted, as if it had come from Chriſt by Tradition; and all profeſſe a readineſs to obey, and therfore are like to perform their word, if occaſion be offerd. Beſides, in Catechiſms and inſtructions, the Common-people are not taught, that the doctrine comes handed down to them from the Apoſtles. In Sermons, we ſee, when any propoſition of difficulty or concernment is treated, proofs are alleag'd out of Scripture and ancient Fathers: a practiſe even the fathers themſelvs continually obſerve, who, having propos'd a point, are ready to adde, it is not they alone that teach this doctrin, but the Apoſtles or Chriſt, or ſome renouned Father; never mentioning Tradition, unleſſe to oppoſe or diſable it, when ſome Hereticks have laid claim to it; as the *Quartadecimans*, *Chyliaſts*, *Communicants of Infants*, and the like.

The charge I confeſs is fierce; let us ſee what powder it bears, what ſhot. We agree, the Church comprehends both learned and unlearned, and ſo are bound to maintain that both ſorts rely on Tradition. As for the firſt objection then, concerning the readineſs to embrace a Councils definition,

with

with the ſame aſſent, as if the truth were deſcended by Tradition; I can either and indifferently grant or deny it: Since, if I pleaſe to grant it, I have this ſecure retreat, that a conditional propoſition has no force, unleſs the condition be poſſible: and for the poſſibility of the condition, I diſtinguiſh the ſubject; which may be matter of Practice and Obedience, or a ſpeculative propoſition. Of the firſt I can allow the aſſent to be the ſame; that is, an equal willingneſs to obſerve it: Of the ſecond, I deny it ever was or can be, that a Council ſhould define a queſtion otherwiſe then by Tradition; Therefore, to rely on the Councils definition taks not away, but confirms the relying on Tradition. This, if need were, I could eaſily juſtifie, by the expreſſe proceedings of all the principal Councils. Thus the condition having never been put, nor ſuppoſed ever will be, all this Argument reſts ſolely on the Objectors credit, and is with as much eaſe rejected as it was propoſed.

Now ſhould I chuſe (according to my above reſerv'd liberty) to deny ſuch equality of aſſent; the Opponent has offerd no proof, and ſo the quarrel is ended: for though I could produce inſtances to the contrary, I think it not fit to multiply queſtions when

the argument can be ſolved with a ſimple denial.

But how the Opponent can juſtify the ſecond branch of his exception, that in *Catechiſms* this doctrin is not taught, I am wholly ignorant. As far as my memory will ſerve me, I never heard the *Creed* explicated, but, when the Catechiſt came to the Article of the *Catholick Church*, he told them how *Catholick* ſignify'd an univerſality of place and time; and that, for this title of *Catholick*, we were to rely on her teſtimony. Likewiſe, in the word *Apoſtolick*, he noted that the Apoſtles were the founders of the Church, and her doctrin theirs, as being firſt receiv'd from them and conſerv'd by the Church ever ſince; and that for this reaſon we were to believe her Authority. Thus you ſee, that famous phraſe of the *Colliers faith* is built on this very principle we maintain. True it is, Catechiſts do not ordinarily deſcend to ſo minute particularities, as to tel ignorant people whether any poſition may be exempt from this general Law: But then we alſo know the rule, *Qui nihil excipit, omnia includit.*

Sermons (upon which the third inſtance is grounded) are of another nature; their intention being, not ſo much literally to teach the Articles of Chriſtian doctrin, as to perſwade

perſwade and make what is already believ'd ſink into the Auditory, with a kind of willingneſs & eaſineſs, that their faith be quickned into a principle of action to govern their lives, the principal end perhaps for which the *Scripture* was deliver'd and recommended to us. Therfore, neither the common practice, nor proper deſign or uſe of *Sermons* reaches home, to make us underſtand on what grounds the hearts of Catholicks rely; who after all diſputations, retire themſelvs to this ſafe guard, To believe what the Catholik Church teaches; as none can be ignorant that has had the leaſt converſ with ſuch Catholiks as profeſs not themſelvs Divines.

For the laſt period of this objection, where the *Fathers* are brought in to cry out againſt Tradition, and *Hereticks* made the ſole pretenders to that title: 'tis a bare aſſertion, without ſo much as a thin rag of proof to cover it; of which, I believe, hereafter, we ſhall have particular occaſion to diſcourſe more largely. Thus cannot all the diligence I am able to uſe find any ground of difficulty in the belief of the unlearned, but that aſſuredly their faith is eſtabliſht on Tradition, if they rely on the Church as it is *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick*; which all profeſs, from the gray hair to him that but now begins to liſp his Creed.

THE FIFTH ENCOUNTER

That Catholick Divines rely on the ſame infallibility of Tradition.

This time now to come to the ſecond part, and ſee what is objected againſt the learneder ſort and the long Robe's Reſolution of their faith into Tradition: And firſt is brought on the ſtage a couple of great Cardinals, *Perron* and *Bellarmin*; the former ſaying, out of St. *Auſtin*, that the *Trinity*, *Freewill*, *Penance*, and the *Church* were never exactly diſputed, before the *Arians*, *Novatians*, *Pelagians* and *Donatiſts*: Whence is infer'd that, as more was diſputed, ſo more was concluded; therfore more known, and conſequently not all deriv'd by *Tradition*.

But if we ſhould anſwer, that diſputing, betwixt Catholicks and Hereticks, is, on the Catholick part, no other then proving and defending thoſe points which were deriv'd by Tradition, and found in Chriſtian action and behaviour, this argument were cut up by the roots, and all pretence and colour

colour of it taken away: Which is the very truth of the buſineſs: this being inſeparably the difference betwixt Hereſy and Catholiciſm, that when thoſe perverſe novelties firſt peep out of their dark grots, the Catholick Religion ſecurely poſſeſſes the World; and upon ſuch oppoſition is at firſt ſurpriz'd, and the Divines, perhaps, put to caſt about for plauſible defences and grounds to ſatisfy unſtable heads, who eaſily conceit themſelvs wiſer then their forefathers, and ſcorn authority, unleſs reaſon proportion'd to their capacity or humour marſhal it in.

Nevertheleſs, becauſe diſputing cannot chuſe but bring to light ſome deductions, conſequent to the firſt & principally-defended Poſition; I ſhall not deny the Church may come to know ſomwhat, which haply before ſhe never reflected on. But then thoſe new truths belong to the ſcience we call *Theology*, not to Faith; and, even for thoſe, the Church rely's on Tradition, as far as they themſelvs emerge from doctrins deliver'd by Tradition; ſo that the truth atteſted by the learned Cardinal out of St. *Auſtin*, is, that, by much canvaſing, more cleer proofs and anſwers are diſcovered, or more ample Theological ſcience concerning ſuch myſteries, acquir'd.

Bellarmin is brought in excuſing *Pope Iohn* 22. from being an Heretick, though he held no ſouls were admitted to the viſion of God, before the day of Judgment; becauſe the Church had not as yet defin'd any thing concerning it: I confeſs, many more might be produc'd deprehended in the like actions; and, before all, St. *Auſtin* excuſing St. *Cyprian* on the ſame ſcore. Now, to draw a concluſion from hence, this is to be added, that ſurely if there had been a Tradition, neither the *Pope* nor St. *Cyprian* could be ignorant of it, and therfore not excuſable upon that account. But, in truth, I wonder this point is no harder preſs'd; for, if any would take pains and look into our *Schoolmen*, they might find very many of them maintain, that *Tradition* is neceſſary only for ſome points not clearly expreſs'd in Scripture: whence it ſeems to follow they build not the whole body of their Faith upon Tradition.

For ſatisfaction of this difficulty, I muſt note, there is a vaſt difference betwixt relying on Tradition, and ſaying or thinking we do ſo. The *Platoniſts* and *Peripateticks* are divided about the *manner of viſion*; *Ariſtotle* teaching, that the object works upon the eye; *Plato*, that the eye ſends out a line of Spirits or rays to the object: Yet nothing

were

were more ridiculous then to affirm, the *Platoniſts* ſaw in one faſhion, the *Peripateticks* in another. Some (as I fear may be experienc'd in too many of our modern *Sceptick*s) are of this deſperate and unreaſonable opinion, that we have no maxims *evident* by Nature, but contradictories may be true at once; the reſt of Philoſophers think otherwiſe: yet we ſee, in all natural and civil actions, both ſides proceed, as if thoſe maxims were evident and irreſiſtable. So likwiſe, there is a wide diſtance betwixt theſe two queſtions what a man relys on for his aſſent or Faith, & what he ſays or thinks he relys on. Look but among the *Proteſtants* or other Sectaries, they are al taught to anſwer, *they reſt wholly on the Bible, the Bible, for their Faith*; but nine parts of ten ſeek no farther then the Commands of their own Church: that is, all thoſe who either cannot read or make it not their ſtudy to be cunning in the Scriptures, or have ſo much modeſty as to know themſelvs unable to reſolve thoſe many intricate controverted points by the bare letter of the Text; who, perhaps are not the leſs numerous, but certainly the more excuſable part of Proteſtants.

Whence, farther, it is clear that, to ask on what a private perſon grounds his belief, and on what, the Church is yet

a more different queſtion; eſpecially, if you enquire into what he *thinks* the Church reſolvs her faith. For, ſuppoſing the Church, as to ſome verity, ſhould rely on Scripture or Councils; a Divine may know the Church holds ſuch a poſition, and yet (though of a juſt ſize of learning) not know, or, at leaſt, not remember on what ground ſhe maintains it: and in that caſe, no doubt but his faith ſtands on the ſame foundation with that of the Church; yet he cannot, perhaps, ſuddenly tel, whether it be reſolved into Scripture or Councils. To conclude therfore this demand, whether *Bellarmin* himſelf rely'd on Tradition, for all points? has not the leaſt reſemblance with this other, whether he thought the Church did ſo? And, to come yet cloſer to the queſtion; 'tis evident, every believer, under that notion, *as a believer*, is unlearned and ignorant: For, as ſuch, he reſts upon his teacher, who in our preſent caſe is, undoubtedly, the *Church* as *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick*; ſo far, therfore, the *Collier* and *Bellarmin* depend on the ſame Authority. As for the other part of the interrogatory, on what he thinks the Church rely's for her doctrin? it may be enquir'd either in common or particular. In common (relating generally to the body and ſubſtance of Catholick doctrin,) there is no doubt,

doubt, among Catholicks, but their reliance is upon *Tradition*, this being the main profeſſion of great and ſmal, learned and unlearned, that Chriſtian Religion is and has been continued in our Church, ſince the days of our Saviour, the very ſame faith the Apoſtles taught all Nations, and *upon that ſcore*, they receive it: Speaking thus therfore, no Catholick makes any ſcruple but Religion comes to him by Tradition.

There remains now, only, what learned men think, concerning the ground wheron the Church rely's, in ſome particular caſes: which we have already ſhewn concerns not their private belief, as 'tis the foundation of their ſpiritual life; for, ſo, they rely on the Church, and what the Church rely's on: and by conſequence, it will prove but a matter of opinion in an unneceſſary queſtion belonging purely to Theology, not Faith, whatever is ſaid in it. Whence Divines in this may vary without any prejudice to the Church or ſalvation, either in private or in order to Government; ſeeing the main foundation is ſurely eſtabliſht, that every believer, as ſuch, rely's on the Church immediatly. This difficulty therfore is ſo far reſolv'd, that it little imports what opinion *Bellarmin* or any other private Doctor holds in the point: ſince it follows

not

not that the Church, or any particular member therof, rely's on such a ground; no not *Bellarmin* himself, though he conceive, in some points, the Church rely's on Scripture or Councils.

But, since St. *Austin* marches in the head of this Troop for defence of St. *Cyprian*, let us proceed with more diligence and respect in reconciling the difficulty. We are to remember, 'tis a different question, to ask Whether an opinion be Heresy? and, Whether the Maintainer be an Heretick? the opinion becomes heretical by being against Tradition, without circumstances; but the Person is not an Heretick, unless he knows there is such a Tradition. Now, St. *Cyprians* case was about a doctrin included in a practice, which, he saw well, was the custome of the *African*, but knew not to be so of the universal Church, till some congregation of the whole Christian World had made it evident. And herein consists the excuse St. *Austin* alledges for St. *Cyprian*; 'tis true, I have no assurance this Apology can be alledged for *John* 22. but another perhaps may, that the multitude of Fathers (which he conceiv'd to be on his side) might perswade him, the opposite opinion could not be a constant Tradition. There remains only *Bellarmins* excuse to be

justify'd

juſtify'd, which is not of ſo great moment: Divines helping themſelvs by the way that occurrs beſt to them, and miſſing in ſuch reaſons, without any ſcandal to their neighbours.

One of theſe two ſolutions will generally ſatisfie all ſuch objections as are drawn from ſome fathers miſtakes againſt the common Faith. For nothing can be more certain, then, if any Father had known the doctrin, contrary to his errour, to have been univerſally taught in the Catholik Church, by a derivation from their anceſtors, beyond the memory of any beginning, he would readily without diſpute have ſubmitted to ſuch an Authority, and ſo much the ſooner, as he being neerer the Fountain, could leſs doubt that the ſtream, of which he ſaw no other riſe, reach'd home to the Spring-head. This therfore is evident, that whoever erred, knew nothing of ſuch a Tradition, whenceſoe're that ignorance took its root: the ſeverall cauſes of which depend upon the ſeveral caſes of their miſtakes, here not preſſed, and therfore not examin'd.

THE

THE SIXTH ENCOUNTER,

Diſabling three other Arguments brought againſt Tradition.

THe ſeventh objection pretends, not only different, but oppoſite Traditions might be deriv'd from the Apoſtles. And this they ſupport with theſe two crutches: one conſiſts in a demurrer, that the contrary is not proved: the other in an Inſtance, that it plainly hapned ſo in the caſe of the *Quartadecimani*, who inherited from St. *John* a certain cuſtom, which was condemned by a practice deriv'd from ſome other Apoſtles. But the weakneſſe of this objection appears by its very propoſal: For, ſince all Catholicks, when they ſpeak of Tradition deliberately and exactly, define it to be *a Doctrine univerſally taught by the Apoſtles*, we may ſafely conclude; where two Apoſtles teach differently, neither is *Tradition:* And that this word, *univerſally*, may not ſeem, by ſlight of hand, cog'd into the definition, on purpoſe to take away this objection; the neceſſity of it is evident: becauſe, all that weare the

the name of *Chriſtian* unanimouſly agreeing that, in point of *truth*, one Apoſtle could not contradict another; wherever two ſuch Traditions are poſſible to be found, it abſolutely follows, no point of *truth* is engaged: An inference expreſly verified in the example of the *Quartadecimans*; their contention being meerly about a Ceremony, not an Article of Faith. Wherfore, only indifferent and unneceſſary practiſes are ſubjects of ſuch a double Tradition: and, by conſequence, ſuch Traditions are not of Chriſtian beliefe, or concerning matters, here, in controverſy; this very definition rather directly excluding them.

The eighth Argument ſeems to take its riſe from our own confeſſions; telling us, We acknowledge ſome points of Faith to have come in later then others, and give the cauſe of it, that the Tradition (whereon ſuch points rely) was, at the beginning, a particular one, but ſo that yet at the time when it became univerſal, it had a teſtimony even beyond exception, by which it gain'd ſuch a general acknowledgment.

The example of this is in *certain Books* of Scripture, as the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the *Apocalyps*; whereof, in St. *Jerom's* time, the *Greek* Churches refus'd the one, and the *Latin* the other; yet now both have prevaild into

into an universal reception. To which I return this clear answer: 'tis the nature of things acted, (that depend on Physical and mutable causes,) to have divers degrees in divers parts, according to the unequall working of the Causes: and so, Christ having deliver'd, by the hands of his Apostles, two things to his Church, *his Doctrin, as the necessary and substantial aliment thereof*, and *his Scriptures, ad abundantiam*; it was convenient, the strength of *Tradition*, for *one*, should far exceed its strength for *the other*; yet so, that even the weaker should not fail to be assured and certain. Upon this reason, the *Doctrin* was deliver'd to all the Apostles, and by them to the whol community of Christians: the *Scriptures*, to some particular person or Church, (yet such whose credit was untainted) and from them, by degrees, to be spread through the whol Church, and communicated to the *Pastors*, in the *Books themselvs*; to the *people*, by their *Pastors reading* and *explications*. For, who does not know, before Printing was invented, the Bible was not every mans money? Whence it appears, *Scriptures* are derived to us by a *lower degree* of *Tradition*, then that of Catholik *doctrin*; and consequently our *Faith* and *acceptance* due to them is not of so high a nature as what we are bound to

in

in reſpect of doctrin. For the *ſenſe* of *Scripture* is to be judged by the *doctrin*: as the *Church* and *cuſtom of Antiquity* teaches us: alwaies commanding and practiſing, that no man exerciſe his wits in interpreting the holy Scripture againſt the *receiv'd* Faith of the Church; as, in all matters of ſcience, they who are Maſters in the Art, judge the text of Books written upon ſuch ſubjects by their unwritten skil and practical experience.

And here I would willingly ask, what ſuch *Proteſtants* as object this to us, can anſwer for themſelvs? ſince they directly profeſſe not to know *Scripture* by the *Spirit*, and therfore muſt neceſſarily rely on *Tradition*; eſpecially thoſe who take for their rule to accept only ſuch Books for Canonical, as were never doubted of: for they cannot deny, but the *Scriptures* were receiv'd in one Church before another; as the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, St. *John*, or St. *Marks Goſpel*, &c. and how do they admit the *Apocalyps*, ſo long refuſed by the *Greek* Churches, whom they uſe to prefer before the *Latin*?

But they preſſe us farther; that, if a particular Tradition became univerſal, this depended on the *Logick* of thoſe Ages, to diſcern what teſtimony was beyond exception. I demand what ſignifies *Logick*? do they

they mean common ſenſe, ſufficient to know three and four make ſeven; or wit enough to comprehend and manage with a juſt degree of diſcretion, the ordinary occurrences in humane actions? If they do; I muſt confeſs it depends on *Logick*: For I cannot think God Almighty deliver'd the Scriptures to Apes or Elephants, who have a meer imitation of reaſon in their outward carriage; but to Men, that have truly underſtanding, and a capacity of evidence within their Souls. But, if they take *Logick* for an ability to diſcourſe beyond the reach of ordinary prudence, and that human evidence which governs our lives; I ſee no occaſion of expecting any ſuch *Logick* in our preſent queſtion.

The ninth attempt conſiſts in a diligent ſurvey of our *Fortifications*, to ſpy out ſome *breach*, or weaker place, by which errour may creep into the Church. This I cannot call an Argument; for none are ſo unwiſe as to make ſuch a conſequence: It may be, therfore 'tis; unleſſe they bring ſtrong proof of this neceſſity in ſome particular inſtance, that may ſhew it to be an exception from the common maxim, *à poſſe ad eſſe non valet conſequentia*: And yet, in this diſcourſe, I find not ſo much as the very *poſſe*, which I thus declare. If any ſhould deny that

George

George could leap over *Pauls-ſteeple*; and a quaint Oratour (to maintain the affirmative) ſhould largely diſcourſe, how the riſe of the laſt footing, the help of a good ſtaffe, the caſt of his body, and many ſuch circumſtances give advantage to the leap; but never think of comparing theſe with the height of the Steeple: no ſenſible perſon would ſay, he had proved the poſſibility of performing ſuch a wild and extravagant enterprize. So, he that diſcourſes at large, how errours uſe to ſlide into mans life, without comparing the power of the cauſes of errour to the ſtrength of reſiſting, which conſiſts in this principle, *Nothing is to be admitted, but what deſcends by Tradition*; as alſo, without conſidering the heat and zeal ſtil preſerv'd alive in the Churches bowels from the great fire of *Pentecoſt*: ſays no more towards proving an errour's overrunning the *Church*, then the Oratour we exemplified, for *Georges* leaping over the *Steeple*. Wherfore this attempt is ſo far from the buſineſs, it deſervs not the honour of being accounted an Argument.

Yet, becauſe we compar'd the propagation of the Catholique Faith, to the perpetuation of Humankind, let us propoſe the like diſcourſ againſt it: and ſay, that in *Affrick* or the Land of *Senega*, there are under earth,

great mines of *Arſnick*: Whereof one may at ſome time or other, vapour a contagious ſmoak, which, encountring with a ſtrong wind from the South, may breed ſo great a Plague in all the North Countries, that none can eſcape it; and hereupon preſently conclude, that all, on this ſide the *Line*, are quite dead, and thoſe who ſeem to live and diſcourſe are but phantaſms and have nothing of real in them: though I believe the inſtances (brought in, for declaration of ſo groundleſs a conceit) may ſeem better to deſerve that name.

THE SEVENTH ENCOUNTER.

Anſwering the Greeks and ſome Divines, who object new Beliefs to the Catholick Church.

THe firſt is of the Greeks; *Hieremie Nilus* and *Barlaam*, who profeſs to ſtand to Tradition and the firſt ſeaven *General Councils*, and can be no way diſprov'd, ſay's the objector, unleſs by what ſhall be as forcible againſt the Catholick cauſe. But truly, this inſtance is ſo lame, it needs a new making, before it be anſwered: For the Author

thor expreſſes not in what points of difference betwixt us and them, he intends to urge it. If, about *ſhavings* or *faſtings* and the like; we ſhal have no quarrel againſt him; if about the *Proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt*, I doubt he will find himſelf entangled in an equivocation, betwixt the matter and manner of that myſtery. However, *that all arguments againſt them will ſerve againſt us*, is but the Authors liberal addition, without any proof or means to gueſs at it. That they accuſe us, to corrupt Tradition by ſowing tares among it, has two parts; one juſtify's my plea, that we rely on Tradition, ſince they charge us with endeavouring to corrupt, not diſclaim it: the other, that we do indeed corrupt it, is only ſaid not proved; and farther ſhews that the plea of the Greeks is *non-Tradition*, alleadging only this, that their Fathers do not deliver the doctrin of the *proceſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt, not that they ſay the contrary; which clearly demonſtrates, there are no oppoſite Traditions between them and us.

As little force has the Note cited out of *Tertullian*, to prove that he thought more was to be believ'd, then what was drawn from antiquity; becauſe he was content private men might begin good cuſtoms in their own houſes: For ſure he could not

believe, that *omnis fidelis* could *conſtituere* for the whole Church, or even for his neighbours houſe. So that we need a great deal of Logick to draw from this remark, the creeping of an errour into the Church: not a word being ſo much as intimated, that this good cuſtom ſhould be againſt what was already receiv'd; which had been enough to make it rejected, and not comprehended, in *Tertullians* known judgment.

There is another inſtance, ſtrongly urg'd and largly dilated; but, if I gueſs right, of ſo much leſs credit, the more 'tis opened. It is out of a hiſtory by one *Wadding*, an *Iriſh* man, concerning two Treaties of two Kings of *Spain* with two *Popes*, to *tear* from them a definition for the *Immaculateneſs of our Ladies Conception*. (I follow an Authors words who has read the book, and it ſeems found a great violence in the carriage of the buſineſs, which made him expreſs it, by the word *tearing.*) Who this *Wadding* is I know not, for I have heard of more then one; but whether this be any of them, I am totally ignorant, having never ſeen the Book nor any other ſigns by which to diſcover the Author.

Out of this Book they collect three arguments: One from *Waddings* teſtimony; another from the State of the queſtion he handles

handles: a third, from his practice, joyntly with the practice of divers others of the ſame degree. For the firſt, I am deſirous notice ſhould be taken of the Authors condition; When he wrote this book, he was Secretary to the Biſhop of *Carthagena*, and He his Kings *Ambaſſador*, to move the *Pope* to define our Ladies Conception without original ſin; and, in ſolliciting this, to uſe an extraordinary importunity: Wherin I ſee two circumſtances that concern the qualification of his Book; One, that he was to act a buſineſs of great heat; and, if his zeal were not conformable to the eagerneſs of his ſenders, he was like to have little thanks for his pains; The ſecond that he was Secretary to an Ambaſſador, by which he had priviledg to ſay and publiſh *Dicenda Tacenda*, whether they were his own opinions or τῶ τυχόντ☉, ſo they any way advanc'd his cauſe.

Now, this encouraged Secretary undertakes to affirm, that many things have been defined againſt the opinions of ſome Fathers; and in the preſent caſe, he ſays, peradventure, it has been defin'd, that our Lady was free from all actual ſin: He adds, the validity of Hereticks Baptiſm, the beatifical viſion before the day of Judgment, the ſpirituality of Angels, the ſouls being im-

mediatly created, and not *ex traduce*, the Assumption of our Lady, and her delivery without pain. To *Wadding* we may add *Salmeron*, who has the boldness to say *Doctores quo juniores eo perspicaciores*. *Poza* is no less audacious, in citing opinions defin'd against the Fathers. *Erasmus* says *myriades Anticulorum proruperunt*. *Fisher*, Bishop and Martyr, and as learned as any in his age, consents that *Purgatory* was brought in by little and little: and *Indulgences*, after men had trembled a while at the torments of *Purgatory*. *Alphonsus de Castro* puts, in the rank of newly receiv'd Doctrines, *Indulgences*, *Transubstantiation*, and the *procession of the holy Ghost*. But beyond all, is the fact of *Clement the eighth*, a grave and wise *Pope*; who, desirous to end the controversy between the *Dominicans* and the *Jesuits* accused by them of *Pelagianism*, neither sent for learned men, by way of a *Council*, to know what their *Forefathers* had taught them, nor examin'd with which of them the purest Ages sided: but refer'd the whole matter to what St. *Austin* said: and so it had been defin'd, had not *Cardinal Perrons* advice prevail'd. And St. *Austin* was so various in his own opinion, that he knew not himself what he held: wheras, before him all the ancients sided with the

Jesuits

Jeſuits. Thus far that Book.

I know this term *Defining*, is frequently uſed by our Divines in matters of the Churches determinations; nor do I ſee any great inconvenience in the *word*, if the *thing* be underſtood, to wit, that *Defining* is nothing elſ but the *acknowledging and clearing a Tradition*, from the dirt and rubbidg oppoſers had caſt upon it. For the reſt, that ſome Fathers have had their eys ty'd, in particular points, ſo far as not to ſee the force of *Tradition*, by which the Church had notice of the truth of ſome poſition, is a thing not to be doubted. And, if it were fit or neceſſary, I could bring inſtances of bold Divines, in our days, ſo blinded by arguments, that they ſee not the light of *Tradition* in ſome particular queſtions; and ſo, the expreſſions only changed, hold condemned hereſies: So ſhort is the ſphear of our diſcourſ, if not directed by a carefulneſs to wel-imploy our Logick, or by a ſecret grace ſteering us towards truth beyond the ability of our Reaſon.

But, what conſequence any can draw, out of theſe ſayings, againſt Tradition, I underſtand not: unleſs this be taken for a Maxim, that every one muſt neceſſarily know, of a ſpecial point, that it is deriv'd by Tradition, becauſe really 'tis ſo; an incon-

inconſequence, I hope already ſufficiently demonſtrated. Now, if theſe two can ſtand together, that, truly the *Church* has a *Tradition* for a point, and nevertheleſs ſome learned man may be ignorant of it; this argument has no force at all.

As to the poſitions he cites for newly adopted into the family of faith; he fairly ſhews the privileg he and his Maſter had to ſpeak any thing that ſounded to his purpoſe, and let his adverſaries take care whether true or no: For, nothing is more clear then that the validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks was a Tradition, and decided by it: ſo, the Beatifical viſion of the Saints before the day of judgment, the ſpirituality of Angels, are not yet held matters of Faith, but only Theological concluſions; as likewiſe, the ſouls being concreated to the perfecting of the body: Then for the bleſſed Virgin's being free from actual ſin, as alſo her Aſſumption, and her delivery without pain (which others add) theſe either are known by Tradition, or not matters of Catholick Faith: and ſo, no ways advance our Adverſaries pretences. For *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, 'tis plain by his very expreſſions, either he means the manner only, or at moſt ſome circumſtances uneſſential to the things, and therfore certainly not cited without

ſome

ſome violence offerd to his words.

Poza is a condemned Authour: and *Salmeron's* ſaying not to be followed, or to be underſtood (as it is, whence he took it) in ſuch things as later diſputes have beaten out more plainly; *Eraſmus* was learned in Criticiſm, and one whom, if not others, his very Engliſh Patrons, *Warham* of *Canterbury*, *Fiſher* of *Rocheſter*, and *More* in the *Chancery*, exempt from all calumny of being a deſertor of the ancient Faith: beſides his own Books, eſpecially his Epiſtle *Ad Fratres inferioris Germaniæ*, by effects demonſtrate his loyalty; whatever bad impreſſions a certain liberty of practiſing his wit too freely may have made in ſome even great and eminent perſons. But, what he ſpeaks concerning Articles of Faith, he either took from the ſcoldings of ſome ignorant Divines, (who are ready to call every word, they found not in their books, when they were Schollers, Hereſie) or elſe becauſe, truly, he underſtood not what belong'd to Deciſions in that kind.

There remain two Authorities really conſiderable; one of the holy Biſhop *Fiſher*; the other, of the prudent *Pope*. As for the firſt, I conceive there is a great equivocation through want of care and warineſſe in diſtinguiſhing. For, let us take either the Coun-

cil

cil of *Florence* or *Trent*, in which we have the Churches ſenſe concerning both *Purgatory* and *Indulgences*; and ſee whether the holy Biſhop ſays any of the points, thoſe *Councils* defin'd, are either denied by the *Greeks*, or brought in by private revelations or new interpretations of Scripture. For, how could he be ignorant; that the *Greeks* had agreed to the *Latin Church*, about the definition of *Purgatory*, in the *Council* of *Florence*; or forget himſelf ſo far, as not to remember a publick practice, *Indulgences*, in all the ancient Church, for remiſſion of the *Penal injunctions* laid upon ſinners? Beſides, he ſays, *the Latins did not receive Purgatory at once, but by little and little.* Whence 'tis evident, by the name *Purgatory*, he means not only ſo much as is eſtabliſhed in the Council, but the manner alſo and circumſtances were introduced by revelations of private perſons and argumentations of Divines. The like he expreſſes of *Indulgences*, ſaying, *They began, after men had trembled a while at the pains of purgatory.* Whence it is plain, he contented not himſelf with the preciſe ſubject of the Councils Definitions, or the ſenſe of the Church; but included alſo ſuch interpretations as Divines give of them. So that, by ſpeaking in general terms, and not diſtinguiſhing the ſubſtance of *Purgatory*

gatory, from the Accidents and dreſſing of it; as likewiſe, in *Iudulgences*, not ſeparating what the Church has alwaies practiz'd from the interpretative extention which Divines attribute to them; he is miſtaken to ſuppoſe new Articles of Faith may be brought into the Church. Neither imports it, that he uſes thoſe words, *No Orthodox man now doubts*; for that's true of ſuch *Concluſions* as are term'd *Theological* and generally receiv'd in the Schools, yet are not arriv'd to the pitch of making a point of *Catholick belief*: beſides, he expreſſes himſelf, that this generality extends no farther, then *That there is a Purgatory.*

In *Clement* the eighth's action, the main point is to conſider, on what grounds he ſought to eſtabliſh the Definition he went about to make. And, upon the immediate ſtep, we both joyntly ſtand; to wit, that it was to finde out, whether parties opinion was conformable to St. *Auſtin*: But, if I miſtake not, my Adverſaries make not the ſame apprehenſion of it that I do. They ſeem to take St. *Auſtin* for one Doctour, peradventure a great one, peradventure the chief, but yet only one: I apprehend him as the *leading Champion* of the Church in the Queſtion of *Grace*; whence it follows, that the Doctrin of St. *Auguſtin* was the Doctrin of all thoſe Catho-

Catholick Writers, by whoſe demonſtrations and authority the *Pelagians* were condemned; that is, it was the faith of the Church in that age, and conſequently, which the Church continued ever after.

Farther, becauſe St. *Auſtin* neither had the Authority to bring in a new Faith, nor pretends it; but both proves his doctrin to have deſcended from his Forefathers, and found *Pelagius* his opinion condemned, before he medled with it, by ſome Council; that is, by the apprehenſions of the then preſent Church; and, as it ſpread from Country to Country, was ſtil found contrary to the receiv'd doctrin, every where planted in their hearts before *Pelagius* contradicted it. Therefore, I ſay, I cannot but eſteem, that, in the point of *Grace*, it is all one to ſay, *the Doctrin of St. Auſtin*, and *the Doctrin of the Apoſtles*, planted by them and continued to St. *Auſtins daies*, illuſtrated by him, and tranſmitted to his poſterity, even to our preſent time. If this be true, (as no Catholik can deny, nor prudent perſon doubt but we eſteem it ſo) *Pope Clement* had great reaſon to endeavour the deciſion of that queſtion by the Authority of St. *Auſtin*: ſince the doctrin of St. *Auſtin* was evidently the faith of that Age; and the faith of that Age the faith of the Chriſtian Church

Church, from the Apoſtles to us.

But we have another quarrel about St. *Auſtins* doctrin, that It is ſo uncertain, himſelf knew not what he held. Nor do I wonder ſuch a thought ſhould fall into the head of a Gentleman-Divine; eſpecially in a Liberty of wit, to cenſure, without the leaſt reſpect or reverence of Antiquity: But I tremble to hear, that ſome (of whom we are in juſtice as wel as charity bound to expect more ſtaydneſs and Religion) ſeem ſo wedded to their own Sect, as to mutter the ſame. My anſwer, I believe, is already underſtood.

I ſay therfore, ſuch as have made it a principal employment of their lives, to be perfect in St. *Auguſtin*; thoſe who with great attention had read his Polemical Treatiſes againſt the *Pelagians*, (as I take it) ſome *five and thirty* times, were of another mind: And ſo are all thoſe who at this day ſtudy him, not to make him ſpeak what they think, but to make themſelvs ſpeak what he thinks.

But this queſtion *tranſiit in rem judicatam*, ſince, when it was handled at *Rome* before the *Congregations*, when both oppoſitions and defences were ſolemnly made by the proof of preſent books, when the maintainers of the opinion accus'd of *Pelagianiſm*,

niſm, were the choiceſt wits and ancienteſt Scholers could be pickt out of that ſo famed *Society*: nevertheleſs, almoſt in every Congregation the ſentence of St. *Auſtin* was judged to be againſt them; as is evident, both out of the printed *Compendium* of the Acts of thoſe Congregations, and the very manuſcript Acts themſelves, extant at this day.

But, let us hear the Pope himſelf ſpeak. Upon the 8. of *July* was held the ſecond Congregation; His Holineſs began with theſe words. *Nos perſonaliter vidimus congeriem locorum, quam vos, qui* Molinam *defenditis, induxiſtis ex Auguſtino; & nullus inventus eſt qui faveat, immo contrarium tenuit Auguſtinus: Unde mirum quòd tot artibus utamini.* And hence it ſeems they were forc'd to corrupt St. *Auſtin* to the Popes face the 30 of *September* following; which being diſcovered, the Authour died of melancholy and diſgrace. Again, in the tenth Congregation, the ſame *Pope* taxed them, *Quod Scholaſticis, maximè ſuis, non Scripturâ, Conciliis, Patribus, uterentur.* A ſign how ſound their way of doctrin is; how ſincere their proceedings to defend it.

Yet, 'tis unged farther, that the Fathers who lived before St. *Auſtin*, are generally of the contrary opinion. This is a ſimple

aſſer-

assertion without proof, and my name is *Thomas*: I would entreat therfore such of my Readers as light on this objection, to remember that the question, of the force of *Grace*, and liberty of *Free will*, consists of two truths, that seem, like the *Symplegades*, to butt at one another, as long as we look at them afar off; but if we make a neerer approach, they shew a fair passage betwixt them. So then, it is not hard that one who studies the question for pleasure, especially in such Fathers as wrote before the combating of the truth by Heresies, should be deceiv'd, by the seeming overlaying of that side, which the Fathers had occasion to inculcate; though they meant nothing lesse then to prejudice the verity, which stands firm on the other side the *frenum* of this disputation. Adde to this, that St. *Austin* himself examin'd the Fathers, and found in them the doctrin he maintain'd; nor could it be otherwise, the general apprehension of the Church being against *Pelagius*. Therfore I shal follow the advice of the Proverb, and be fearful to *leap before I look*: especially, since a great reader of St. *Chrysostom* solemnly profess'd he could shew as strong places in him for *Grace*, as in St. *Austin*; though he be the man chiefly set up against St. *Austin*.

THE

THE EIGHTH ENCOUNTER,

Shewing, our Ladies immaculate conception is not likely to become an Article of Faith.

AS for the ſtate of the queſtion, about *our Ladies being conceiv'd in Original ſin*, ſome would willingly perſwade us, the Negative is in great probability to be defin'd; whereas certainly there is no Tradition for it (if *Wadding's* ſayings be rightly reported.) But if *defining* ſignifies the *clearing of Tradition*, (as we explicate it) nothing can be more evident, then that there is no probability of defining the negative part: rather it may be in danger of being, at leaſt, cenſured, for raſhly putting an exception in the generall rule of Scripture, which expreſly condemns all but our *Saviour* to Original ſin; except the defenders can ſhew good ground for the priviledg they pretend, which I much doubt. For, as far as I can underſtand, the whol warrant of that opinion ſtands upon a devotion to our Lady, ariſing chiefly from a

perſwaſion that original ſin is a diſgrace to the perſon in whom 'tis found: So that, if the people were taught original ſin is nothing but a diſpoſition to evil, or a natural weakneſs, which, unleſs prevented, brings infallibly ſin and damnation; and that in it ſelf it deſerves neither reproach nor puniſhment, as long as it proceeds not to actual ſin, the heat of vulgar devotion would be cool'd, and the queſtion not thought worth the examining.

However, ther's no great appearance of deciding that point in favour of the negative; ſince the earneſt ſollicitations of two ſo potent Kings could ſo little prevail towards it: For, all that was done had only this deſign, to appeaſe the ſeditions ſprung up in *Sevil* by occaſion of a *Dominicans Concluſions*, in which he affirm'd that our Lady was *Conſpurcata* with *Original ſin*. But, the controverſy was ſo uncivilly carried, that it ſcandaliz'd our Engliſh Merchants; as one of them there preſent told me not long after, meeting him at *Dunkirk*.

But becauſe this objection is much urged, let us ſee the probabilities of its being deſin'd. The firſt is, that the maintainers of the Affirmative are only a few of one *Order*, and ſome few taught by them: But, if good account be made, I believe theſe few will

prove some thousand or fifteen hundred of the most learned in the Christian world. Their *Order* is known to have always been the flower of the Schools; to have had the Inquisition many ages in their hands: to have a stile of Divinity of a higher strain then ordinary; by their great study and adhesion to the Doctrin of St. *Thomas* of *Aquine*: Their Monasteries nnmerous, especially in *Spain* and *Italy*; no great Convent wherin there are not a dozen or more grave and learned Divines, almost all the honours amongst them being distributed according to the probate of ability in knowledg: so that the *Order* is no contemptible part of the *Learning* of the *Church*. Neither is it credible their Schollars can be few; much less, as this Author passionatly terms them, *unus et alter*.

He objects farther, the subscriptions of many Prelates, Orders and Universities, the general acclamation of the people, the weighty necessity of cutting off scandals; That some Universities oblige the Schollars to make vows to maintain the negative; and in a word that the Affirmers hold against the whole Church. Nor do I doubt that many Prelates, Orders and Universities subscribed the Negative, and peradventure to the Petition, or that the

people

people (who follow the greater cry) did demand the ſame: but, that the Affirmers held againſt the whole Church, I totally deny, and ſhew manifeſtly the contrary. For, *Buls* having been accepted and ſtanding in force, by which all *Cenſure* againſt the Affirmative is forbidden, and no one ſyllable obtain'd any way derogatory to the probability of the opinion; but generally, a *caveat* to the contrary expreſly put into ſuch inſtruments and the Defenders of the negative ſubmitting to them: 'tis clear, that all the maintainers of the Negative alow the Affirmative to be probable, and by conſequence not againſt the conſent of the Church; ſince it ſeems to imply a flat contradiction, that the Church ſhould believe a Negative to be true, and yet at the ſame time admit the affirmative may be true.

Now, as for Univerſities, there are entire ones for the Affirmative; and that, not on the ſcore of St. *Thomas*, but of the *Fathers*. What Univerſities ſtrive for the Negative, ſo ranckly as to make men take vows; I know not: The Article of *Paris*, as I hear, is only that they ſhal not teach it in the Univerſity; elſ-where every one is free. As for hindring ſcandals, 'tis a neceſſary part of Government; but certainly obliges not to a defining or deciding of Truths accor-

ding to the inclinations of the people, push'd on by the clamours of violent Preachers.

Notwithstanding all this, our adversary presumes this very point may prove an Article of Faith; especially, if a Council should meet about the decision: wherin he proceeds with a very high confidence, it being, as he thinks, now ready to topple into a matter necessary to salvation. But I am far from that mind: for I see the fervours of the Schools are a quite different thing from the judgments of the Church, and how little all those tumults moved the Court of *Rome*, and certainly would have made far less impression in a general Council. The controversy betwixt the *Jesuits* and the *Dominicans*, what a busle makes it in the School and in the world; while it stands upon the fairer tongue, upon motives esteemable by the people, and meer plausibilities? Wheras coming to be examin'd before the *Pope* in Congregations, it could not hold water; but the weaker part was forc'd to break off the court of judgment, by mingling Princes quarrels into Ecclesiastical questions. I dare confidently say, if the Point of *our Ladies Conception* were to be handled, either in a Council or grave Congregation: the party that free her (set-

ting aſide the paſſions of Princes) would be diſtreſſed to find an argument that themſelvs ſhould hope would endure the diſcuſſing. And ſo, the pretty gradations of our imaginative adverſaries, who ſo eaſily frame a ladder for this opinion to climb up into a matter of Faith, is like an odd attempt of an acquaintance of mine; who, being come out of *Lancaſhire* to go beyond-ſea, and repulſ'd at *Dover* for want of a Paſs, put off his hoſe and ſhooes and began to wade into the ſea; when, being asked what he meant, he anſwer'd he would go on foot, ſince they would not let him paſs in the Boat; for, ſaid he, I have often waded through the *Beck* at my Fathers door when the bridg was taken away. By which counterfeiting of ſimplicity he got to be admitted into the ſhip: wheras thoſe who make their argument from the School-diſcuſſions to Church-definitions, will (if I am not miſtaken) remain on the wrong ſide of the water.

THE NINTH ENCOUNTER.

Shewing the unanimous agreement of Divines, that all infallibility is from Tradition.

THe third argument is drawn from this *Waddings* proceedings and his consorts, with the addition of another not unlearned man (according to the court of these times) who puts *Scripture* and definitions of the Church to be the adæquate ground into which our Faith is resolv'd. Besides, 'tis urg'd, that even those who speak of Tradition, seek it not in the testimony of the present Church, but of the ancient Fathers: This being already answer'd in the sixth Objection, we need not here add much to it; For what imports it, if *Wadding* and his associates understood not upon what grounds the Church uses to resolve and decide controversies, (and therfore bring Revelations, Metaphorical expressions of Scripture, the cry of the people, a multitude of School Divines, and the like arguments) so that in their lives and believing or acting as

as Chriſtians, they proceed not out of theſe grounds, but, by the *Colliers* principle, rely on the Church, and by her, on what ſhe rely's. *Galilæo* diſlikes the notions of wet and dry, which *Ariſtotle* gives: do they therfore diſagree or not know one anothers meaning, when they talk of a wet and dry cloth? Among our modern Philoſophers great quarrels there are about the explication of *time* and *place*: yet this hinders not, but that in common diſcourſ, when they ſpeak of years and days, Country's and Towns, they make a ſhift to underſtand one another.

The reaſon is, becauſe theſe conceptions (uſed in ordinary diſcourſ) are planted in them by nature; the ſame objects working the ſame effect upon ſouls of one nature: But the other notions are made by ſtudy and artificial proceeding, and prove falſ or true according as the precedent diſcourſes are fallible or ſolid. Even ſo, believing is made by nature in us, and is all alike in thoſe to whom the object is propoſed alike: But to explicate and declare it, happens differently among Doctors, as they underſtand better or worſ.

Now then admit all thoſe we call Schoolmen were againſt the doctrine I maintain, though I conceive ſuch an univerſal agree-

ment

ment impossible, unless they be supposed to demonstrate their *Tenets*, (which if they do, I readily submit; if not) what doth it impeach the opinion I defend? or what would it avail to bring one or more on my behalf; whose authorities may be rejected with the same facility as offer'd; since they neither carry with them security from error nor evidence of Truth? let us therfore permit Divines to try out their own quarrels in their own Schools: not mingling them in our business.

Yet, to give some satisfaction, let the objector answer me himself: Does not the greater part of Divines seek out *Tradition*? Yes will he say: but not that Tradition which rely's on the present Church: for they seek it in laborious quotations of Fathers, in all ages. Let's agree then in this, They seek Tradition as well as I: But I pray what do they intend by so great labour in heaping of Fathers? do they mean it was those Fathers opinion? and so make their conclusion good, because such a number of Doctors held it: or do they farther pretend, out of these Fathers testimonies, to shew it was the publick doctrin of the Ages in which they lived? If the adversary be as ingenuous as he is ingenious, he will confess they pretend to argue the *publick belief*

out

out of this numerous Catalogue. Nevertheleſs, for fear ſome other may be more reſerv'd, let's remember, what was before objected, that ſome points have been defin'd, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of many Fathers; and this, by the verdict of theſe Divines: Whence it clearly appears that this numbring of Fathers would not make a doctrin certain to them; unleſs they thought the ſenſe of the reſpective Ages were imply'd in it: Therfore, in concluſion, it is evident that they alſo rely, for Faith, upon the ſucceſſion of it through divers ages; which is the ſame as the Doctrin's being handed from the Apoſtles to us. So that you ſee we all agree; and I, whom you took to be particular in this conceit, am thus far of the common opinion.

But the adverſary urges, that I come to the knowledg of this ſucceſſion, by the teſtimony of the preſent Church; wheras they who ſearch it in Fathers find it by the conſent of antiquity. Suppoſe it be ſo: what difference makes this? It is too great a ſervility to be bound not to ſay any word but what has before faln in my adverſaries way: Yet, at leaſt, can he juſtify this? do not thoſe Divines according to what himſelf would have them ſay, profeſs that the preſent Churches definition makes a certainty in

our

our Faith? Admit then the preſent Church (in a Council or otherways, as it ſhall pleaſe thoſe Divines) ſhould define, that a point doubted of were come down by Tradition, from the Apoſtles to us; would not they ſay, Tradition were ſufficiently known by ſuch a Teſtimony? Surely it cannot be deny'd; I ask again: whether the profeſſing a point of doctrin to be hers, by receiving it from hand to hand, be not to teſtify and define that Tradition ſtands for this doctrin? Therfore all ſuch Divines confeſs Tradition may be known by the teſtimony of the preſent Church.

Why then do they uſe ſuch diligence in collecting ſo many paſſages out of Fathers? chiefly for this reaſon, becauſe Sectaries deny that principle: therfore they are forc'd for their ſatisfaction (not for inſtruction of Catholicks) to take ſo much pains with little thanks many times. Though it be true their learned labours confirm, beſides, ſome weak believers, and enlighten the borders of Catholick Faith: and ſo in themſelvs are both ornamental and profitable to the Church.

And now, what if I ſhould add, that theſe very Doctors hold there is no ſecurity of Faith, but only by *Tradition?* I know I am thought ſubject to talk Paradoxes: never-

theleſs

theleſs, becauſe it is a point important to the unity of the rule of Catholick Faith, out it ſhall go, and the diſcourſ be neither long nor obſcure. I ask therfore, do not theſe Doctors require to the *certainty* of a *Definition*, that the *Definers* proceed without malice or negligence, and uſe all human endeavours to diſcover the truth? I cannot anſwer for every particular, but am ſure the principal Divines requiſre theſe conditions: otherwiſe they doubt not but the definitions may be erroneous. I ask again; what *certainty* can we have of this proceeding of the *Definitors?* or was there ever Council yet, againſt which the condemned Party did not cry out, that they had fail'd in obſerving them? I conclude therfore two things; firſt, that, in the Churches definitions of this nature, there can be no more then the certainty of moral Prudence, according to theſe mens opinions, (if they follow their own grounds:) Secondly, that there is no Moral quarrel betwixt Sectaries and them, concerning the infallibility of ſuch definitions: for the exception generally, in the firſt condemnation of any hereſy, riſes from this part, Whether the Judg proceeded equally? and not, Whether, if he did ſo, his authority were to be rejected? there being ſeldom found ſo blind a boldneſs in any as to ſay, a

Judg

Judge does him wrong, and yet proceeds rightly: for either he judges what he underſtands not, and that's raſhneſs; or, ſeeing the right, he pronounces wrong, and that's malice: both which are unexcuſable from injuſtice. So that, I believe, in this point, they do not aſſure the Church againſt Hereticks, though both ſides ſhould agree in the ſpeculative part, that the *Definitors* were infallible.

I know, Divines ſay, Catholiks are bound to believe the *Definitor* proceeded as he ought, unleſſe the contrary be evident; and I ſee they ſpeak with a great deal of reaſon: but withall, I ſee this maxim is a principle of Obedience and Action, not of Infallibility and belief.

I have yet a little ſcruple about this doctrin. For, either the Definitors are aſſur'd the doctrin they define is true, or no: If not, how can it be ſaid they proceed rationally, who determin a poſition, as certain, which they ſee not to be ſo? If they are, then the Opinion was certain, before the Definition, on ſome ground precedent to, and independent of it; and ſo, not made certain by the definition, but only declar'd to the ignorant, by the Authority of the Definer, that it was and is certain, upon other grounds. Now, excepting *Tradition*, *Scripture* and *Definiti-*

ons,

ons, I know not any thing men ſeek into for an irrefragable Autority: Therefore, what is *defin'd*, muſt be, before, certain, either by *Scripture*, or by *Tradition*.

Let thoſe Divines, now, chuſe which they think fitteſt to cleave to: For *Rushworth* has declared his opinion ſufficiently; and it is clear enough, what all they muſt ſay, Catholiks or Proteſtants, who think the Scripture needs Explicators, to make a point certain. Neither can we doubt of this, if we look into the actions of the Catholik Church; where we ſee an Heretick is term'd ſo, for chuſing an Opinion againſt the Faith certainly received, and in poſſeſſion of the Church from which he ſeparates himſelf. But this ſeparation is, at the beginning of the errour, and before the interpoſure of the Church: He is therefore an Heretick, before any deciſion makes him ſo.

THE TENTH ENCOUNTER

That there was no Tradition for the errour of the Chiliaſts.

BEſides the objections we have already endeavoured to anſwer, ſome other inſtances

ſtances are urged: As, of *Origen*, whoſe doctrin being explicated in ſuch large volumes, how an Adverſary can draw it into the compaſs of Tradition, or how it can be argued, that the condemning of him was a breach of Tradition, I know not. But chiefly they inſiſt upon the *Chiliaſts* errour, as an unqueſtionable Apoſtolicall Tradition. To try the buſines, let us remember, we cal'd *Tradition, the handling of a doctrin, preach'd and ſetled in the Church of God by the Apoſtles, down to later ages.* Now then, to prove the *Chiliad* opinion was of that nature, the firſt point is to evince, that it was publiſh'd and ſetled by the Apoſtles: the contrary whereof is manifeſt out of *Euſebius* Hiſtory, who relates that the root of it was a by-report collected by *Papias*, a good, but credulous and ſimple man. His goodneſs ſurpris'd St. *Irenæus*; who (as may be infer'd out of his *Presbyteri meminerunt*) learned it of *Papias*, (for the plural number does not infer that there was more then one, as all know that look into the nature of words; or, if there were more, they may be ſuch as had it from *Papias*) St. *Juſtin* the Martyr eſteem'd it not, as a point neceſſary to ſalvation; but rather a piece of Learning higher then the common: ſince he both acknowledges other Catholicks held

the

the contrary, and entitles thoſe of his perſwaſion κατὰ πάντα ὀρθογνώμονες, *right in all opinions*, that is, wholy of his own mind; for no man can think another right in any poſition, wherein he diſſentes from him: Nay, he ſhews that the *Jew* (againſt whom he diſputes) ſuſpected his truth, as not believing any Chriſtian held this opinion; ſo rare was it among Chriſtians; nor does he ever mention *Tradition* for it, but proves it meerly out of the *Prophets*. Whence it appears, there is no ground or probability this was ever a Tradition, or any other then the opinion of ſome Fathers, occaſioned by *Papias*, and confirm'd by certain places of Scripture, not wel underſtood, moſt errours being indeed bolſter'd up by the like miſapplications; a ſcandal that ever ſince the practice of the Tempter upon Chriſt himſelf, may wel be expected to importune Chriſtians.

But firſt is objected in behalf of the *Chiliaſts*, that they had no Tradition againſt them. To which I reply, A contrary Tradition might be two waies in force againſt them; one formally, as if it had been taught by the Apoſtles directly, *Chriſt ſhall not raign upon earth a thouſand yeers, as a temporall King*: The other, that ſomething incompoſible with ſuch a corporal raign was

taught

taught by Them: and of this I finde two; one general, another particular; the generall one is, that the pleaſures and rewards promiſed to Chriſtians are ſpiritual, and the whol deſign of the Chriſtian Law aims at the taking away all affections towards corporal Objects; whereas this Errour appoints corporal contentments for the reward of Martyrs, and by conſequence, either encreaſes, or at leaſt foſters the affection to bodily pleaſures and temporal goods: The particular one is, that Chriſt being aſcended to Heaven, is to remain there till the univerſal judgment: Wherfore it is evident, by the later, that it is againſt Tradition; and, by the former, that it is not only ſo, but a Mahumetan, or at leaſt, a Jewiſh errour, drawing men eſſentially to damnation: as teaching them to fix all their hopes and expectance hereafter on a life agreeable to the appetites of fleſh and blood.

'Tis oppoſed alſo, that the Fathers of the pureſt Ages receiv'd it, as deliver'd from the Apoſtles. A fair *Parade*! but, if we underſtand by the *Fathers*, *One*, St. *Irenæus*; and him deluded by the good Zeal of *Papias* (as *Euſebius* teſtifies) but good even to folly (for leſſe cannot be ſaid of it;) where is the force of this ſo plauſible argument? Adde to this that the very expreſſion of *Ire-*

neus proves it to be no Tradition; for he ſets down the ſuppoſed words of our *Saviour*, which plainly ſhews it is a *Story*, not a *Tradition*; a *Tradition* (as we have explicated it) being a ſenſe delivered not in ſet words, but ſetled in the Auditors hearts, by hundreds of different expreſſions explicating the ſame meaning.

There follows *Juſtin Martyr's* teſtimony, That All Orthodox Chriſtians in his age held it; (for δόξα and γνώμη (ſay they) are not ſo different, but one may be taken for the other.) Nevertheleſſe, there is no ſuch ſaying in *Juſtin*; for, however δόξα and γνώμη may paſs one for the other, yet the word ὀρθόδοξος has (by Eccleſiaſtical uſe) an appropriation to the Catholik or Chriſtian right believers, which deſcends not from the Primitive, and ſo cannot be transfer'd to the Derivatives from γνώμη: Wherfore ὀρθογνώμων is neither fairly nor truly tranſlated *Orthodox*.

No more does it help the Adverſaries cauſe, that *Juſtin* compares the maintainers of the contrary opinion to the *Sadducees* among the Jews: For, he mentions two ſorts of perſons denying his poſition; wherof one he reſembles to the *Sadducees*, the other he acknowledges to be good Chriſtians, and ſays they are many, or (in the elo-

quent uſage of the word πολλοὶ) the *Commonalty* of Chriſtians.

Nor wil the next Objection give us much trouble, That none oppos'd the *Millenary* errour before *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*: To which we apply this anſwer: Firſt, for any thing we know, it was hidden and inconſiderable till his time, and then began to make a noiſe, and cauſe people to look into it. Secondly, there are probable Motives to perſwade, it was impugn'd long before: For, it being clear, that both Heretiks and Catholiks ſuſtain'd the contrary, we cannot wel ſuppoſe it was never contradicted till then, though the report of it came not to their ears; ſince, who conſiders the few monuments we have of theſe firſt Ages, muſt eaſily diſcern the hundred part is not deriv'd to us, of what was then done. But laſtly, admit there was no writing againſt it till *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*; does it follow, there was no preaching neither?

As little can be gathered out of St. *Hierom's* being half afraid to write againſt it; both becauſe he did write againſt it, as is clear in his comment upon St. *Matthew*, and upon *Ezekiel*, where he cals it a *Jewiſh Fable*, l. 11. and becauſe the multitude he ſpeaks of, argues nothing of Tradition, but

the

the numerosity of that sort of believers, occasion'd by the writings of the Heretick *Apollinaris*, as the same Saint testifies, *Comment.* 10. *in Esaiam.* Neither doth St. *Austin* stick to condemn it, since those words *c.* 7. 24. *de Civit. Dei*, *esset utcunque tolerabilis*, signifie, that it is not tolerable.

Yet truly I cannot but admire, that he who puts the *Chiliasts* opinion to have been deriv'd duely and really from the Apostles by verbal Tradition, should conceive that either St. *Hierom* or St. *Austin* could think such a Tradition to be no sign of the Churches doctrin, or not care whether it were or no: which seems to me the same as to impute to these Saints a neglect of what they thought to be the Churches opinion; or elf, to the *Church*, a neglect of what was Christs doctrin, if She would not accept what She knew was descended verbally from Him; or, at least that St. *Austin* and St. *Hierom* lay this great slander, of neglecting the known doctrin of Christ, upon the Church.

THE ELEVENTH ENCOUNTER,

That there was Tradition for the Trinity, before the Council of Nice.

THe *Chiliad* errour ſeems to have been only an Uſher to the *Arian*; which ſpeaks far louder for it ſelf. And that learned Cardinal *Perron* is placed in the front of their Evidence, whoſe teſtimony is, that The *Arians* would gladly have been try'd by the writings yet remaining of thoſe Authors who lived before the Council of *Nice*; for in them will be found certain propoſitions, which now (ſince the Church-Language is more examin'd) would make the Speaker thought an *Arian*. From whence the Oppoſers infer, that before the Council of *Nice*, there was no Tradition for the myſtery of the bleſſed Trinity. But to maintain this conſequence, I ſee no proof; for the Cardinal's words clearly import that the Fathers before that Council (though being Catholiks, they knew and held the myſtery of the Trinity, yet) in ſome phraſes ſpake like *Arians*: How then can any man draw

draw out of this Antecedent, that theſe Fathers believ'd not the *Trinity*, or had not receiv'd by Tradition the knowledg of that Myſtery? I confeſs my ſelf unable to ſee the leaſt probability in ſuch an inference.

If it be permitted to gueſs what *they* aim at that make this objection: I believe it is that, ſome propoſitions concerning the Trinity, by diſputation and diſcuſſion, have been either deduced or clear'd, which before were not remark'd to draw ſo much conſequence upon the myſtery, as ſince is found they do: out of which they think it follows that ſuch propoſitions were not delivered by Tradition, and ſo not our whole Faith. To this the anſwer is ready; that, as he who ſays a myſtery was taught by the Apoſtles, does not intend to ſay the Apoſtles taught what the words were, in every Language, which were to ſignify this Myſtery; ſo neither is his meaning that they taught, how many ways the phraſe in one language might be varied, keeping the ſame ſenſe: But, as they left the former to the natural Idiom of the ſpeaker or writer, ſo the latter to the Rules of Grammar; as likewiſe they left it to the ſpeakers skil in Logick, to contrive explications or definitions for the terms wherin they deliver'd the Myſteries.

It is not therfore to be expected that men,

who had receiv'd the Myſtery ſimply and plainly, ſhould, without both art and attention, know how in different caſes, to explicate it according to the exact rules of Science. And thus, the defect of the argument or arguer is, that he ſuppoſes, not only the main verity ſhould be formally convey'd by *Tradition*; but all manner of explication and in all terms, which the ſubtlety or importunity of Hereticks could afterward drive the Catholicks to expreſs this Myſtery by: a task both impoſſible to be perform'd, and moſt unreaſonable to require, and perhaps unprofitable if it were done.

Nor therfore does it follow that ſomthing is to be believ'd, which came not down by Tradition: For, as he that ſays *Peter is a man*, ſays he is a living creature, a body, a ſubſtance, (though he uſes not thoſe words,) becauſe all is comprehended in the term *Man*; ſo, he that delivers *One God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, delivers, that thoſe perſons are not *Alia* but *Alij*, and that truly the Son is not an Inſtrument, a commanded ſervant &c. Yet, as it may happen, that one man ſees another to be, but knows not what the definition of him is; nor needs he ordinarily know it, becauſe he knows the thing defined: ſo may it alſo chance that ſome Fathers, who knew well

well enough the myſtery, might falter in explicating it preciſely according to the rigour of Logick; and 'tis no good conſequence, The Fathers were leſs exact in ſome expreſſions concerning the Trinity, therfore they held it not or had not learn'd it by *Tradition*.

Yet I muſt alſo intimate, theſe differences of ſpeech proceeded many times from the various uſage of the words; as the Greeks generally ſay, the Father is *cauſe* of the Son; the Latines abhor it, calling him *Principium*: which difference is not in the meaning, but in the equivocation of the expreſſion. So we read in St. *Athanaſius*, that he found an oppoſition in ſome people; one ſort ſaying there were in the Trinity three *Hypoſtaſes* and one Οὐσία; another three Οὐσία's and one *Hypoſtaſis*: and St. *Hierom*, though perfect in the Greek Tongue, was ſo exceedingly troubled with this queſtion, that he ſent to St. *Damaſus* for the reſolution of it; yet he wel knew there was no difference in the ſenſe, but only in the terms; however he fear'd leſt, by the wrong uſe of the words, he might unawares be drawn into a wrong meaning. So likewiſe did St. *Athanaſius* find, that the two former parties, of which we ſpake, agreed in the Catholick *ſenſe*, though their *words* were oppoſite.

The

The reason of this opposition is the nature of these two words, Ουσία and *Hypostasis*, which primarily and radically signify the same thing; *Aristotle* telling us, that *Hypostasis* is *prima* or *primo substantia*, which in Greek is Ουσία: whence it appears, this word, Ουσία, does not signify what in Latin is call'd *natura*, (to which the word *substantia*, by use, is now appropriated, when we speak of this mystery) but only in a secondary sense. Again, the word *Hypostasis* is deriv'd from *Substando*, or *Subsistendo*, and therfore usually translated *Subsistentia* and might properly be exprest by *Substantia*.

Now, applying this to the mystery of the *Trinity*, Because in God there is one common *Nature*, abstrahible from three *proprieties*; therfore the *nature* seems to *substare* to the said *properties* and so deserv the name *Hypostasis*: wherupon some explicated the *Trinity* to be *una hypostasis, et tres Ousiæ*. For *Ousia* being deriv'd from ὤν or *Ens*, and *Ens* or *Substantia* and (in Greek) *Ousia* signifying primarily what the Schools term *Suppositum* (that we see with our eys, a demonstrable singular, named substance, as *Bucephalus*, *Athos* &c. which among men (if restrain'd to particulars) is call'd *Socrates* or *Plato*, (if used at larg) in the common name a person:) these men, very Catholikly, said three *Ousia's*

ſia's; and one *Hypoſtaſis*, meaning three Perſons and one God. But, the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* (by much pondering theſe words, by their debates with the *Arians*, and to determine a rule in ſpeaking, that Catholicks might not be ſubject, through equivocation, to be drawn into errour,) agreed upon the contrary; becauſe *Hypoſtaſis* was more commonly in uſe for that we call a *Perſon*, and *Ouſia* was rather a School term fetch'd from Philoſophers books, and therfore might, with leſs violence to common language, be taken in a ſecondary ſenſe. Thus it became the rule of ſpeaking in the Church, to ſay three *Hypaſtaſes* and one *Ouſia*.

Beſides, thoſe ſpeeches which *Perron* cites are not ſo harſh, but as, in a rigorous interpretation, they are falſ, ſo, in a moderate ſenſe, they contain undeniable truths. Philoſophers divide inſtruments into *Conjuncta* and *Separata*; and, among the *Conjuncta*, number up our Arms and Legs &c. which are our very ſubſtance: It does not therfore follow, if the *Son* be called an *Inſtrument*, that his *ſubſtance* is diſtinguiſh'd from the *Subſtance* of his *Father*; becauſe the *Inſtrumentality* conſiſts in nothing but the difference of their notional conceits of *Being* and *Knowledg*, wherof *Knowledg* ſeems to be

but

but the *Vehiculum* of *Being* towards the operation or effect: So likewise, whoever works by a power that is not in himself, otherwise then from another in whom 'tis *principialiter* and (as the Greek speaks both anciently and at this day,) *Authoritativè* may, not improperly, be said to be commanded; though the other be not his *Master* or *Better*. Neither is there such rigour in the genders of *aliud* and *alius*, but that *aliud* is many times apply'd to the person; and only Ecclesiastical use, grounded on the height of propriety and distinction of Genders, binds us to this manner of speaking, which for unity and charity sake we observe.

Out of what has been discours'd about the name *Ousia*, we may easily solve the seeming contradiction of the Council of *Antioch* to that of *Nice*: for, if *Ousia* may signify a *person*, (as we have shew'd it does, in its best and chiefest signification;) then *Homoousion* signifies *the same person*. So that the Conncil of *Antioch*, denying Christ to be *Homoousios* to his Father, deny'd no more then that he was the same person with his Father; which no subtlety can ever prove to be against the Fathers of the *Nicen Council*. Nor is this said to reconcile contradictories, but discover equivocations: For that this was the true reason of the opposi-

tion

tion, is eaſily deduc'd out of both St. *Athanaſius* and St. *Hillary*, and the queſtion which St. *Hierom* made to St. *Damaſus*.

But it may be urged, if there were a verbal Tradition, how could the Chriſtians, through want of caution, contradict one another: or, had it been as known a part of Religion as *the Reſurrection*, how could *Conſtantine* have ſo ſlighted it, when it firſt roſe, or *Alexander* the holy Biſhop for a while have remain'd in ſuſpence? To this I anſwer, If, by *verbal Tradition*, be underſtood, that the Tradition was deliver'd in *ſet words*; certainly thoſe *ſet words* could not be doubted of, though their ſenſe muſt needs be capable of eternal controverſy: but the meaning of *verbal*, here intended, is only as contradiſtinguiſht to *written* Tradition; which (being in *ſet words*, whoſe interpretation is continually ſubject to diſpute) is therfore oppoſed to *Oral* or *mental*, where the *ſenſe* is known, and all the queſtion is about the *words* and *expreſſions*.

Nevertheleſs, ſuppoſe it had been deliver'd in a ſet and determinate phraſe, and that Hereticks began to uſe other words; a controverſy might be about thoſe terms which the Hereticks introduc'd, and many might demur, uncertain of the queſtion in ſuch new expreſſions: as we ſee, thoſe who

rely

rely on Scripture are in perpetual quarrels about the ſenſe; wheras, to Catholicks, the *ſenſe* of their Faith is certain, though the *words* be ſometimes in queſtion.

The reaſon therfore, why, at *Arius* his firſt broaching that deſperate hereſy, *Alexander* remain'd a while in ſuſpence, was not that he underſtood not his own Faith, but becauſe he apprehended not what *Arius* meant, nor whether his propoſitions were contrary to the receiv'd truth: But when once *Arius* broke into thoſe ſpeeches, that *Chriſt was a creature*, and that *there was a time when Chriſt was not*; then that holy Biſhop likewiſe broke into thoſe words, *Quis unquam talia audivit?* and this is the crime which *Socrates* reprehends in *Arius*, that he began to move points πρότερον ἀνεξέτασα, formerly not queſtion'd, but receiv'd with an uniform conſent and credulity. As for *Alexanders* praiſing, ſomtimes one, ſomtimes the other party, it proves no more then that he was a prudent man: thongh *Ruffinus* ſeems to tax him of overſoftneſs. But, becauſe few falſities can be void of all truth, and few truths (at leaſt before much diſcuſſion) totally free from all mixture of circumſtantial errour; therfore it could not be otherwiſe then wel, to praiſe both ſides ingemuouſly, according as they ſpake truth and reaſon,

and

and diſcommend them, when they fell into falſities.

As for *Conſtantine's* ſlighting the Queſtion at firſt, it ſhews no more but that, then, he did not penetrate the conſequence of it, or rather, was not well enform'd concerning it. For, ordinarily, the craftieſt and moſt active party are they who make the firſt report; and if themſelves be in the wrong, (as many times ſuch are more eager and diligent then thoſe that hold the right) their remonſtrance is accordingly. And ſo it was: for, *Conſtantine* receiv'd his firſt information at *Nicomedia*; very probably too, from *Euſebius*, Biſhop of that City, a moſt perverſe adherent to *Arius*: nor did *Conſtantine* himſelf know wherin the queſtion conſiſted; as appears by this; that in his whol Letter there is not one word of explication of the point, but only in common, that it was of ſlight queſtions, not belonging to the ſubſtance of Faith; the *Arians* ſtil craftily endeavouring to diminiſh the importance of the controverſie. Beſides, we have good ground to believe, that ſome learned men in Court were prevented by *Arius*, and ſollicited into a ſecret favour of this errour; from whom, 'tis likely, proceeded that motion of *Conſtantine* to the *Council*, for determining the point out of

Scrip-

Scripture. Nor imports it, that the Biſhops contradicted not this propoſition of the Emperour in words; becauſe they had reaſon to follow it, (though not to that end to which the Emperour propos'd it, *viz.* the ſolution of the queſtion, but) to the conviction of the *Arians*, and ſatisfaction of the world.

For, to ſpeak to the reality of the buſineſs, there was no doubt among the Fathers about the truth or falſity of the main matter, (being fully ſatisfied concerning that, by Tradition, even from their childhood:) but the queſtion was about the anſwer to their enemies proofs, and to conſult what arguments and reaſons ſhould be alledged againſt them; for the ſatisfaction of the Church, and the world without the Church, and for the expreſſion of the Catholik doctrin, in ſuch words as the *Arians* could not equivocally interpret to their own perverſe meaning: eſpecially, finding they had ſo puzled the world with the duſt they had rais'd in mens eyes, that even ſome good Catholiks could ſcarce ſee their way, but were in danger of ſtumbling againſt the blocks thoſe Hereticks maliciouſly caſt before their feet. *Euſebius Cæſarienſis* teſtifies of himſelf, that He thought *Alexander's* party had held the *Son* of God to be divided from

from the *Father*, as one part is cut from another in *Bodies*; which would have made God a body, and truly two Gods.

For theſe reaſons was their *magna conquiſitio*, their turning of Scriptures, and their meeting in Council, as St. *Athanaſius* witneſſes, ſpeaking in the name of the very Council it ſelf, in his Epiſtle *de Synodis*: We met here (ſays he) not becauſe we wanted a Faith, (that is, *becauſe we were uncertain what to hold*) but, to confound thoſe who contradict the truth and goe about novelties.

Neither can any argument be made out of *Euſebius*'s Epiſtle to ſome *Arians*, in which he ſays, The Biſhops of the Council approved the word *homoouſion*, becauſe they found it in ſome illuſtrious Fathers: for, though the inward ſenſe of that term was perfectly traditional, yet was it not til then precifely fixt to that particular expreſſion. But the ſame Biſhops conſented to the Excommunication of the Contradictors, *to hinder men from uſing unwritten words*: and was not that a proper and prudent remedy to prevent the inconveniences that eaſily ariſe from confuſion and incertainty of language; when every one phraſes the myſtery, according to his private fancy, and governs not his terms by ſome conſtant and ſteady rule,

as

as, the writings of the Apostles or ancient Fathers: which interpretation exactly agrees with the Greek of *Eusebius*, φωναις ἀγραφοις, that literally and truly signifie Words written neither in Scripture nor any where else, as the word ὁμοούσιον was in the Fathers. And so, I need not alledge He was a secret *Arian*; though, if he were, his testimony, as far as it reaches, would be so much the more efficacious against them, as *Theodoret* imploys it.

Now, by all this may be seen, why in Councils there are engag'd so many disputations: for no calumny can be so impudent as to deny, the Fathers know their Faith before they meet there; which is plainly imply'd by the Hereticks ordinary protesting against them, as unfit Judges because they are parties, and therfore refusing to come to the Council; besides, the possession of the old Religion being as publik and notorious, at such times, as the Sun it self at noon: wherfore, to say they come to seek out or dispute their Religion, by those long conferences, is a pure folly. They then hold their Religion upon *Tradition* or *possession*: but dispute things, either for regulating the Churches language, that all Catholiks may keep a set form of explication of their Faith; or else to convince their

Ad-

Adverſaries out of ſuch grounds as themſelvs admit.

To diſpute, whether a *Council*, not confirm'd by the *Pope*, makes an Article *de fide*, or no? concerns not the difficulty now before us; and engages Catholick againſt Catholick, which is not our preſent work. In the mean while, out of all which has been ſaid, we may gather, that there is no apparence the Catholick Doctrin, concerning the *Trinity*, was diverſly taught before the Council of *Nice*, and, then firſt, eſtabliſh'd out of the Scriptures: but, that it was the known and confeſſed faith of all the Ages before, as St. *Athanaſius* expreſly teaches; avowing confidently he had demonſtrated it, ſupplicating the Emperour to permit the Catholicks to live in the belief of their Forefathers, and upbraiding his adverſaries that they could not ſhew their progenitors. And to ſay the truth, unleſs a man be ſo perverſe as to affirm Chriſtians did not uſe the form of *Baptiſm* preſcrib'd by Chriſt, there can be no doubt of the *Tradition* of the bleſſed *Trinity*: the very words of Baptiſm carrying the Tradition in themſelvs.

Laſtly, 'tis objected, there was no reaſon for the Council of *Nice*, in this quarrel, to look into *Tradition*, ſince they had ſuch abundance of *Scripture*. But we muſt

put out our eys, if we do not ſee that even at this day the *Arians* are ſo cunning as to avoid the ſtrongeſt Texts of *Scripture*, and explicate them by other places; and that 'tis impoſſible to convince, in this manner, any Heretick, as long as one place can explicate a hundred oppoſed. The Council therfore, at laſt, (though favour'd with as much advantage as Scripture could give over its adverſaries) was forc'd to conclude out of *Tradition*: as *Theodoretus*, St. *John Damaſcen*, and chiefly St. *Athanaſius* himſelf confeſſes: a neceſſity which the Rules of St. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, St. *Baſil*, and *Vincentius Lyrinenſis* (who teach, *it is to no purpoſe to diſpute with Hereticks out of Scripture*,) and our own experience of above a hundred years, plainly convince and fully juſtify to any rational man, whoſe humour or intereſt is not to have all Religion obſcure and doubtful.

THE

THE TWELFTH ENCOUNTER.

That the neceſſity of Communicating Infants is no Tradition; But Prayer to Saints is.

THere are yet two inſtances urged againſt *Tradition.* One that, for ſix hundred years, 'twas believ'd neceſſary to give the holy *Euchariſt* to children; which cuſtom has now been a long time diſuſed. The proof, as far as I know of the *neceſſity*, is drawn only out of St. *Auſtin* and St. *Innocentius*, and ſome words of St. *Cyprian*: The former of which Fathers are cited to make this argument againſt the *Pelagians*, The *Euchariſt* cannot be given, unleſs to thoſe who are baptized: But the *Euchariſt* is neceſſary for *Children*: Therfore *Baptiſm* is neceſſary for them. To which I anſwer with a formal denyal, that any ſuch argument is made by thoſe holy Fathers: For their diſcourſ runs thus, It is neceſſary for *Children* to be incorporated into Chriſts myſtical body; but this cannot be done without Baptiſm: therfore Baptiſm is ne-

ceſſary for *Children*. Whether of us take the right ſenſe of theſe Fathers, let the Books judg; I will only add, 'tis a great ſhallowneſs to think the *Pelagians* (who deny'd the neceſſity of Baptiſm) ſhould admit the neceſſity of the *Euchariſt*, or that it was eaſier for thoſe Fathers to prove the neceſſity of the *Euchariſt*, then of *Baptiſm*; So that, their argument muſt be ſuppoſ'd, by the objector, to be drawn *ex magis obſcuro ad minus obſcurum*.

Yet, becauſe, eſpecially, St. *Auſtins* words ſeem equivocal, I will briefly ſet down the ſtate of the queſtion. St. *Dennis* tels us, no Prieſtly funetion was compleat without the adminiſtration of the bleſſed Sacrament: Thence came a cuſtom to communicate thoſe who were baptiz'd. This cuſtom reached even to Infants, but neither univerſally, that is, in all Churches nor indiſpenſably: For, it was only then uſed, when *Biſhops* were preſent at Baptiſm; as is apparent, both becauſe *Communion* was never adminiſtred, anciently, but after *Confirmation*; and becauſe, it was always held for the complement of all Prieſtly Benedictions, as is before declared: Beſides, in ſome Churches, there is not the leaſt ſign that ever it was given to *Infants*.

Another thing to be underſtood is, that St.

Auſtin

Auſtin uſes to explicate the Communion to be an incorporation into Chriſts myſtical Body; of which no doubt but the Sacramental body is both a figure and cauſe. This St. *Auſtin* himſelf, upon the ſixth of St. *John*, plainly delivers, and, in his phraſe, takes the *eating* and *drinking* of *Chriſts Body* to be *Faith* or *Baptiſm*: So do *Oroſius*, *Proſper*, *Fulgentius* and *Facundus*, either explicating or following him. This equivocal manner of ſpeaking makes thoſe, who are either not attentive enough, or not willing to have him ſpeak orthodoxly, conſtrue his words *Grammatically*, that are ſpoken Allegorically; which laſt his beſt Interpreters, and moſt expert in his works, accompt to be his opinion.

But to conclude this Hiſtory, After their loud and full cry, as if the prey were in their ſight, which I believe wil never come within their reach, (for a deep mouth is a ſign of ſlow heels;) let us ſee how neceſſary the *African* Church (an objection more ſtrongly urged) thought Baptiſm it ſelf was to *Infants*, that is, in how perpetual uſe. And preſently *Tertullian* (the mainly cited and glorify'd for St. *Cyprians* Maſter) tells us. *lib. de Bap. c.* 18. *Itaque pro cujuſque perſonæ conditione ac diſpoſitione, etiam ætate, cunctatio Baptiſmi utilior eſt.* St. *Auſtin*, (Diſciple

to the other two) reports what hapned to himself, having ask'd Baptism in his Childhood, by reason of a sudden danger of death: which being passed, his Baptism was defer'd by his Mother; *Quia viz. post lavacrum illud, major et periculosior in sordibus delictorum eatus foret*; and adds, *ita jam credebam, et illa, et omnis domus, nisi solus pater.* And that *this* was not the Faith of that house only, but of the whole Country, is evident from these words; *unde ergo, etiam nunc, de alijs atque alijs, sonat undique in auribus nostris: Sine illum, faciat quod vult, nondum enim Baptizatus est.* If then Baptism it self was not perpetually administred to Infants, can we think the Eucharist was? or is here any probability it was *so* us'd to children, as not to be also often omitted, and that lawfully?

Maldonatus (a grave man, otherwise) exceeded, and I wonder he is tolerated, speaking so directly against the Council of *Trent*, after the publishing of it. But his assertion is manifestly false: Since, 'tis known *Communion* was not used to be given but after *Confirmation*; and *Baptism*, without *Confirmation*, was held sufficient for salvation; as is beyond cavil, expressed by St. *Hierom, in Dialog. cont. Lucifer.* about the middle.

The laſt inſtance is of *Prayer to Saints*, which is proved not to have proceeded by *Tradition* from the Apoſtles time; by four arguments. Firſt, becauſe divers Fathers held that the ſouls of Saints were not receiv'd into Heaven, till the day of Judgment; therfore certainly they would teach no prayer to Saints. The Antecedent I will not diſpute; not that I believe it, but that I know not what it is to our queſtion: For, ſuppoſe they are not; may they not nevertheleſs pray for us? we Catholicks think that *Jeremy* the Prophet was not in the *Macchabees* days admitted into Heaven, yet we make no difficulty to believe that he did *multum orare pro populo & ſancta civitate.* Thoſe Fathers that are cited for the *Receptacles*, are acknowledg'd to place the Saints in *Sinu Abrahæ*; and our Saviour teaches us, that *Dives* prayed to *Abraham.* The Proteſtants, as well as we, allow prayer to living Saints: wherever then the dead Saints are, are they worſe then when they were living, that they may not be prayed to? But the principal anſwer to deſtroy utterly this objection, is, that thoſe who ſay we learn by *Tradition*, that *Saints are to be prayed to*, ſay likewiſe we have learn'd by *Tradition* that Saints go to heaven, that is, are admitted to the ſight of God, before the day of Judgment. The

The next proof is, that prayer to Saints began with a doubting preface of εἴτις αἴσθησις; to which *I* find my ſelf no ways engaged to frame a particular anſwer, having no farther ground from my Adverſary (who cites not any Author) to explicate the meaning of this objection. I remember, *Cardinal Richelieu*, at his death, is reported to have taken his kinſman, *Marſhal de Meilleray*, by the hand, and told him that, *if the next world were ſuch as was figured to us here*, (I deliver what I conceiv to be the ſenſe, not the words) *he would not fail to pray for him*: Now ſome, who had a hard opinion of that great Perſon, would preſs out of this ſpeech, that he beleev'd not the Immortality of the Soul. Whether this alſo be pretended to be the meaning of that Optative term, εἴτις αἴσθησις, I cannot judg; for then I ſhould eaſily admit it has ſome force againſt the Tradition of praying to Saints: But, if it be but an Oratorial expreſſion and obteſtation, ſuch as is in St. *Paul*, when he preſſes men to good works, by the like phraſe; I know not how it reaches any way to his intent, and much leſs againſt the receiving of this uſe by Tradition: except the objector ſuppoſe that, truly, the firſt Prayer he finds in writing was the firſt that ever was made, which is neither proved nor probable.

The

The third oppoſition is out of *Nicephorus Calixtus*, who reports, that Prayers to the *Virgin Mary* were firſt brought into the publick *Liturgie*, by *Petrus Gnapheus*, a Heretick. The conſequence I ſhould make out of this antecedent is, that, ſeeing the Author's being a Heretik (a condemnd and hated Perſon) could not hinder this inſtitution to take root and be approved, 'tis a ſign it had a deeper foundation then of his beginning: not that it was before in the *Liturgie*, but that it was an ordinary practice among Chriſtians; which uſe, becauſe we know no origin it has in *Scripture*, muſt have been out of *Tradition*, and not of a ſhort time: how our Adverſary wil prove the contrary, I am not able to make any likely conjecture.

The laſt argument is drawn out of the confeſſion of our own Doctours, who affirm, there is no Precept for praying to Saints in the Church of God (for ſo much is meant by thoſe words, *ſub Evangelio*;) and yeild the reaſon, that Pagans might not think themſelves brought again to the worſhip of men. Which Antecedent having two parts, the non-precept, and the reaſon thereof: out of the firſt part nothing can be deduced; out of the ſecond this conſequence is inferred, Pagans would be equally ſcandaliz'd by

by the Permiſſion, as by the Precept. Wherefore, if it be commanded, neither certainly ought it be permitted.

Although no law obliges one Divine to maintain the reaſons of another, yet I ſee no ſuch evidence in this conſequence, as, for it, to renounce the reaſon: for, me thinks, if thoſe we call *Saints*, were meant to be Gods, we ſhould of *neceſſity* be bound to worſhip them; whence it follows, if it be not *neceſſary* to worſhip them, neither are they Gods, nor the worſhip exhibited to them, ſuch as is due to God; but only of that degree which we give excellent creatures: a poſition ſo conformable to Nature, that it can ſcandalize none but the enemies of Perfection; who, under pretence of avoiding Idolatry, take away the due honour and excitation to Vertue. But, which way, out of a *non-Precept*, can be infer'd the *non-Teaching* of the Doctrin, I cannot imagine; ſince what thoſe Doctors hold, continues true at this day, when it cannot be denied that *Praying to Saints* is both taught and practiced: For though, in our prayers, there be ſome directions to Saints; yet, generally, Chriſtians are not bound to ſuch devotions, and they that are, 'tis but their own voluntary acceptance of the obligation to which ſuch prayers are annexed.

THE

THE THIRTEENTH ENCOUNTER

Reflecting on certain conſiderations: and ſhewing that there is nothing able to diſprove the Church of Rome's Communion to be the ſigne of the true Church.

ALthough, out of the whole preceding diſcourſe it be evident that this way I defend, makes the Churches Definition depend upon the *Tradition* of the point defined, and not *Tradition* upon them; as if, becauſe *by Tradition*, we know the Churches Definitions to be true, therfore we know the truth deliver'd by Tradition: Nevertheleſs, ſince there may be ſome truth in this reflexion, That *Tradition* is known ſometimes by *Definition*, let us ſee what can be ſaid againſt it: Tis firſt, therfore, put into conſideration, whether ſince four Diſciples of Chriſt have written Goſpels, or the Goſpel, that is, as much as they preach'd (for they preach'd nothing but the Goſpel:) if God would have us truſt the Church, he was

was not both to ſpecifie ſo much, very plainly, in them, and farther deliver ſuch ſigns as were neceſſary ever to know Her by.

For anſwer, I ask a croſs queſtion, Whether if God Almighty would have all men ſee by the *Sun*, he was firſt to tell them which It is, and paint 'Its picture on every wall, that ſo we might know which is the *Sun*? And becauſe my queſtion may ſeem rather offenſive then deſerving any anſwer, I proceed to the application; and ask, Whether any of thoſe Chriſtians, of whom Saint *John* ſays, *exierunt ex nobis*, could doubt which was the Church, wherof he had been a part and left it? And, ſince you cannot anſwer otherwiſe then affirmatively, I think I need not repeat the ſame queſtion, of *Arius*, and *Pelagius*, and *Luther*. If then God has provided for all theſe, that they were taught to yeild obedience to the definitions of this *Church*, ſo clearly, that they could neither doubt which *Church* was their teacher, nor of what *Church* he ſpake; how dare they preſume to accuſe him of deficiency in his providence? The ſame *Authority* that gave you the *Scripture*, and told you it was the *Word of God*, ſaid likewiſe, that what ſhe taught was *no leſſe* the Word of God. If you believe her report for the *Book*, why refuſe you it for the *Doctrin*? If her recommends

mends be not ſecurity enough for the one, they will certainly prove far leſs for the other; ſince, unleſſe I am ſtrangely miſtaken, the doctrin of the *Catholik Church* is not ſo hard to believe, as the ſtory of the *Bible:* let any *Atheiſt* or diſcreet *Moore* or *Pagan* be judge.

Oh, but ſince the Evangeliſts wrote *Goſpels*, they wrote all they preach'd; for they preach'd nothing but the *Goſpel.* The *Goſpel* is known to be the ſame with the Greek *Evangelium*, that is, the *Good-ſpel*, or happy tidings of Chriſts comming: ſo that the Book or Preaching which tels us *Chriſt is come*, is a *Goſpel*, be there never ſo much, more or leſſe, in the Book or Sermon: how then it can be infer'd out of the name *Goſpel*, that the Apoſtles writ as much as they preach'd (for it is not credible they preach'd all they wrote) I am not able to comprehend.

The ſecond conſideration is, how we know when the Church has defined? To which I anſwer, In the practice of ſixteen ages it has no more been doubted, when the *Church* had *defined*, then when a *Parliament* had *enacted*: Why then is there required more information? But, ſome Divines ſay more, ſome leſs to be enough. Let them be doing in the Schools, as long as the practice

ctice goes on sufficiently for the Churche government.

Thirdly, we are to consider, Whether sufficient notes be left to know the Church by? But who shall use these notes? Catholicks? They are in the Church. Hereticks? They know what Church they forsook. Pagans? They look not into the Scriptures to finde the Churches mark. Peradventure those Hereticks whose separation is so long since, that they remember not out of what Church they went. But none are grown so aged yet. However the marks of the Church are apparent enough in Scripture, if there want not wil in the seeker to acknowledg them.

The fourth consideration is, Whether points of Faith, or to be of Faith, be infinite (new ones continually springing) or finite? if finite, why are they not all delivered at once, to make an end of incertitude and defining? The answer is, they are both finite and infinite: finite, in *gross*, and wholy delivered by the Apostles, wholy believed and practis'd by this present Church; but infinite, in the *detail*, by which mans wit can parcel out this general stock of Faith. For, as soon as any sharp and crafty Heretik has varied some proposition, necessary to the explication of a fore-believed Doctrin, there may be occasion of setling some new

propo-

propoſition, which ſhal be no other then a part of what was formerly believ'd in *Subſtance*, though not ſo explicitly deciphred. As he that profeſſes Chriſt is a Man, implies he has a mans Nature, a mans Underſtanding, and Will, and Action; though this word *Man* diſtinguiſhes not preciſely theſe faculties: nor does he that repeats all theſe qualities in particular, ſay any more then he that ſaid in general he was a Man. Now then I anſwer the objection, as *Æſops* Maſter did thoſe who would have bound him to drink up the Sea: ſtop the Rivers (ſaid he) and I will performe my bargain: So ſay I, hinder impertinent curioſities from importuning the Church, and her Truths wil be undoubtedly ſeen in her belief and practice, without making new Definitions.

The laſt objection; that it will appear a ſhift to ſay the Churches definitions are certain, and yet not let it be known when ſhe has defin'd, of it ſelf falls flat to the ground: both becauſe I take not that way; and, if I did, ſince we are not troubled about knowing our Churches Definitions, who have the burthen of obeying and do it in practice, the Objectors are confuted as *Diogenes* did *Zeno*, (when he diſputed againſt *motion*,) by walking before him.

For all this, the Church of *Rome* muſt not

eſcape

escape yet: And so, we are told that, if she were design'd for the *Pharos* to know the rest of the Church by, somwhat had been advan'd; for, otherwise (say they) we can assign no mark of the true Church, the *Roman* being deny'd to be such as we make her. First, I answer, we have no need of recourse to the Church of *Rome*; it being the infallible distinctive sign of the Church, *to lay claim to the handed Doctrin*, or, *Tradition*, which evidently appears cannot be claim'd by two: For, if two agree in a point to day, and one dissent to morrow, it were madness to say the disagreer can lay claim to yesterdays opinion.

Secondly, we say, if we would fly to the *Roman* Church, the oppositions force us not from it: For, why is not *Cardinal Perrons* answer to *Plessis* invincible, that the *whole Church* condemn'd St. *Cyprians* proceedings? Likewise the *Asian Bishops* were condemn'd in the Council of *Nice*. The *African Bishops* question was about the enacting a Law, which nevertheless, was carried for the *Bishop of Rome*.

If the Fathers remit us to the *Apostolical Churches*, whose *successions* were, then, visible and evident; what's that to us, now, when all *successions* are interrupted, save only that of the *Roman Church*? The definition

of

of the *Council of Calcedon* is known to be only the conſpiracy of a *Cabal*, never approved as legitimate; but reverſ'd afterwards: So that all theſe angry darts turn their points againſt their Authors; the judgment in every inſtance having paſt in favour of the Church they oppoſe. But this queſtion, concerning the Church of *Rome*, is of greater extent and importance then to be huddled up in one ſheet of Paper: Therfore, let us leave Her to the acknowledg'd Majeſty ſhe poſſeſſes in the Chriſtian world; and not, by ſlight objections and anſwers, rather ſeem to undervalue her Dignity, then either oppoſe or defend her Authority.

You preſent us therfore next, with what is kept for the cloſing of our ſtomacks; and they are two diſhes: One, that at laſt we Catholicks reſolve into *Reaſon*, as well as *Proteſtants*. To this I anſwer, if you mean we muſt ſee *Reaſon* why we give credit to *Authority*, I agree with you: But then, ſince Reaſon is on both ſides, Why (ſay you) muſt it be a *Wall* to us, and a *Bulruſh* to others? Ile tell you. *Reaſon* has two parts, *Demonſtration* and *Sophiſtry*; and, in *Demonſtrations*, that evidence which governs our Lives, is the moſt familiar to us, and conſequently, beſides its firmneſs, 'tis the moſt clear and leaſt denyable: Now, this propoſition,

ſition, that we ought to *believe* a *knowing perſon*, in *that* wherin our ſelvs are *ignorant*, is, of this nature, a Maxime that governs all our life, publick and private: wherfore *our* ground or *Reaſon*, is a *wall*, a rock, or if any thing be yet more ſolid. On the other ſide, of all parts of *Sophiſtry*, that which is built on broken ends of obſcure ſentences of dead men, who cannot declare themſelvs, is the moſt weak and contemptible: and *this* being that you rely on, *Reaſon* therfore, to *you* is weaker and more deceitful then any *Bul-ruſh*.

The ſecond diſh is, that whatever is deliver'd in defence of the Church of *Rome*, only proves that, *as yet*, ſhe is the true Church: not that ſhe cannot leave the way ſhe is in, and fall to reform (as her adverſaries cal it;) or that there may not happen ſome *Shiſm* among the Churches *now* adhering to her, where both parts may claim Tradition: and then where is the guide? To this I anſwer, I will not weigh the proofs of others for the eternity of the *particular* Church of *Rome*: ſince there is no conteſt betwixt us here, about that: but thoſe who are acquainted with *controverſies*, cannot be ignorant, that our writers intend to prove *Her* indefectibility. All I'le ſay is, did you but agree with us, that ſhe is at *preſent* the true

Church,

Church, it would be argument enough for you to ſubmit, til the caſes happen which you ſuppoſe poſſible; and I ſhould think my ſelf too grating and ſevere towards a Perſon, in other reſpects extreamly recommendable, if I ſhould preſs harder, then ſo upon him, nor could I deſire a repaſt more delightful to my ſoul, then to have ſeen *that* in practice concerning him, which is now too late to be hoped.

THE FOURTEENTH ENCOUNTER.

Four other Arguments reverſ'd.

SUch is the condition of Religion, when the liberty of chuſing is permitted to all that have the boldneſs to challeng it; who having no other Scales, to poiſe any arguments propoſ'd them, then the affection to their own wils or prejudice againſt others reaſons, ſuffer every light objection to overballance the moſt weighty and ſolid Demonſtration. Therfore am I forc'd to follow certain other Adverſaries (my chaſe not being confin'd only to the *noble* game) into every by-turn and beat every little buſh,

bush, where either the necessity of a desperate cause, the fables of some wild Reporter, or the craft of any jugling Hypocrite can drive them to hide their weak heads in.

As for reason, in our present business, they tel you, every one is born in *liberty* to Religion, and, til it be demonstrated he is bound to acknowledg some Teacher, the presumption stands for *liberty*, and, 'tis meerly of curtesy and graciousness, they take the pains to bring arguments for the Negative. This I shal answer as the *Caprich* of some pragmatical Chaplain; not having incivility enough to entertain the least suspition, that so great a Wit, stored with Art, in so busy a time about questions of government, should bring forth so mishapen a Monster. But alas! what cannot an unruly fancy, that bites the bridle of reason? Say then, my young Divines, of Politick, of Paternal government, what you say of Religion: Is not the absurdity so palpable, it wil make you asham'd? That no child is bound to honour Father and Mother, till it be demonstrated to him he ought to do so? No Subject to obey the Magistrate, til, after a long dispute his power be evidently proved legitimate? Pass from these to Arts, and say every one may play the Physitian, the Pilot, the Judg, (for Doctor of Divinity, you freely

ly give your licence to all the world) without having any Maſter or Teacher, what a goodly Common-wealth you wil make?

But 'tis reply'd, *Nullum tempus occurrit veritati*, no more then *Regi*; ſince *veritas fortior eſt Rege*. I, Sir, but in your *major* you put *veritas*, and in your *minor*, *falſitas*. For, what is your truth, when you come to declare your ſelf, but probable arguments, of which nothing is more certain, then that they have no truth in them? a proof, as ſuch, ſtill carrying its truth in its force of concluding; but probable arguments have no force to conclude, and conſequently, no truth. For, the truth of a *ſaying* is different from that of an *argument*: a true *argument* being *that* which *proves* the thing to be; a true *ſaying* which only *affirms* it to be.

And, if we look into it, we ſee, what I ſay is but the Law of Nature, and naturall conſtancy: for as, *to not act*, 'tis enough to have *no* reaſon; but, *to act*, we ought to have a *poſitive* cauſe: ſo, to *remain* in the Religion of our Birth and Education, there is no other reaſon requir'd, then becauſe we are in it; whereas, to *change*, we muſt have efficacious motives to perſwade us.

Here, my Adverſary wil exult, and think, at leaſt, Proteſtants cannot become Catho-

liks,

liks, without evidence, which he conceives impoſſible. And, I grant his conſequence, if he can prove his ſuppoſition. For, to my ſight, nothing is more clear then, that Proteſtants *chang'd* their Religion from being Catholiks, and that upon but probable grounds: whence it is evident, no Proteſtant, who is formally ſuch, (that is, holds his Religion on probable arguments, againſt the Catholik Church) but ſtands in a continual formal rebellion againſt *Her*, who by his own acknowledgment was once his Magiſtrate, and againſt whom himſelf confeſſes he has no more then probable exception.

Therfore, whoever, of a Proteſtant becomes Catholik, goes ſo far with evidence, that he reconciles himſelf to a government under which he once was, and had no juſt reaſon to depart from it, (none being ſufficient to excuſe ſo great a diſorder) and ſo, ought, under peril of eternal damnation, return to his firſt obedience. For, where he is, he is certain to find no ſecurity; ſince, his relyance, by his own verdict, is at moſt but upon plauſible arguments: wheras, under the other government, there may be certainty, for ought he knows; of which there is this fair motive, that they all profeſſe it, which is more forcible for the credit of it

it, then what ever he can ſay in abetment of the contrary. Raſhly, therfore, he oppoſes himſelf to follow a falſ way, a way that aſſuredly leads to unavoydable precipices.

They reply, the *Turks* alſo agree in the *Law* of *Mahomet*, and yet that brings no evidence their Law is true. But alas! they obſerve not that, in ſaying ſo, they unawares call themſelves no Chriſtians: For, to us, this conſent is no argument *Mahometaniſm is true*, becauſe it carries no farther then that *the Law is Mahomets*; And ſo far is manifeſt out of *their* common agreement: therfore, in parity, 'tis evident, out of the conſent of *Chriſtians*, that the doctrin handed down from the *Apoſtles*, is *Chriſts*; and the doubt may perhaps remain with the Objectors, but not with us, whether *Chriſts* doctrine be true? as neither we nor they doubt that *Mahomets* preaching was falſ.

And ſeeing the caſe is common to all Chriſtians, againſt the Roman Catholik, he only relying on *Tradition*, they all renouncing it, he only can run his Religion up to the Perſon of *Chriſt*, and there leave it ſecurely eſtabliſht, upon the infallible credit of his word. And as no other ſort of Chriſtian ſociety can pretend to this priviledge, ſo neither can they with any colour of juſtice, exempt

exempt themſelves from the Authority of that Church that enjoys it: an Authority, which, if ever ſhe had, and ſuch as ſhe claims it, is of ſo unchangeable a nature, being conſtituted by God, being the *rock* on which the ſalvation of mankind is built, and the fundamental *ſtone* of the Church, no time nor variation of material accidents can prejudice or preſcribe againſt it. Wherfore, if Proteſtants at firſt departed unjuſtifiably, they remain for ever guilty of the ſame crime, til they reſtore themſelves to the Primitive union.

Again, who, unles he had renounc'd all morality, ever call'd it *liberty*, not to know, or not be bound to the rules and principles of good life? Sure theſe objectors either think religion concerns not good life, but is a vain and empty *Idea* in the air, little important whether it be known or no: or forget themſelves ſo far, as to fall into the ſequel of this groſs abſurdity. Beſides, who can be ſo deſperatly paſſionate, as to term it liberty, to have no good *government*; and relaps again to the rude ſtate of barbarouſnes, where murther, rapes, & a thouſand intolerable inſolencies are publikly permitted? For, if we caſt our eys on the End of Religion, we ſhall ſee, that to want the due Rules, is as inconvenient towards the direction of mankind to final beatitude

beatitude, as the Laws of *Canibals* are deſtructive to all civil and friendly ſociety. So that 'tis to be ignorant of all reaſon, to cry up a liberty to have no Religion, or to chuſe one indifferently, as unconcern'd whether it be right or wrong. Were it not better plainly to avow the preferrence of the pleaſures and profits of this world, before hopes ſo far off as the future life; then, with theſe ambuſhes, to enſnare unwary ſouls into the ſame inconveniencies, under title of *a probable Religion?*

And truly, if we look upon their lives, we ſhall find that *hoc Janus ſummus ab imo Perſonat.* I intend not by this any waies to derogate from the old *Roman vertues*, in this ſort of people, as if there may not be found *Regulus's*, or *Cato's*, or *Seneca's* among them: for, I doubt not but the very vapour of Chriſtianity has this wholſom effect among whom it paſſes, to breed in them as *Heroick* ſpirits as ancient *Rome* ever ſaw, and more too, if the like occaſions preſented themſelves: But Nature, and Generoſity, and Opinion, too often challenge their ſhares, or rather maſtery, in ſuch actions; and how little can juſtly be aſcribed to the hope of heaven, I rather ſuſpect then declare.

To return therfore to our diſcourſe. The *Jew*, the *Turke*, the *Heathen*, can pretend a pro-

profeſſion of his Religion; for all theſe ſtick to ſuch concluſions as their principles afford them: But the *Chriſtian*, who cals Chriſts doctrin *his*, and confeſſes that he or his Sect has deſerted thoſe who alone pretend to the *ſucceſſive livery and ſeiſin* of it, can no way preſume to the poſſeſſion, till he plainly demonſtrate the clearneſs of his title. Wherfore, it avails not any drowſie, rather then quiet, nature, to ſay his Father, (and peradventure Grandfather) was Proteſtant before him, and therfore he is *Poſſeſſor bonæ fidei*, whilſt he pretends only probable arguments: for ſo long he implies the poſſeſſion to be unjuſtly detain'd from the advers party, who has the actual receit by ſucceſſion; eſpecially when this ſo unparalleld a Riot is committed without ſufficient evidence, by the very Actors confeſſion. A *Proteſtant* then, has no better claim to poſſeſſion of Chriſts Doctrine, by his ſo long continuance in Hereſie, then the *Parricide* in *Ariſtotle*, who, having beaten his Father pleaded that his Father had beat his Grandfather, and his Grandfather his great Grandfather: as though ſuch a graceleſs *entail* could prejudice the law of Nature.

Though not ſo abſurd, yet as weak is another Objection taken from the Jewiſh *Cabala*: however, it ſeems worthy of thanks

to

to the Suggestor. What it was, is not hard to guess, our *Saviour* himself having given us the hint of it, when he reproach'd the *Jews* for following the *Traditions* of their Fathers or *Elders*, to the ruin of Gods commands. But to decipher it better, I ought to divide it into *matter* and *form*. The form I call the Rules: the matter, what was deliver'd or found out by these Rules. As for the *matter*, it seems in some way proportion'd to the proceedings of certain of our Divines, who pretend to be *mysticall*; and their imployment is, in the sublime mysteries of our Faith, to invent or imagin what they think congruous circumstances, to move the affections to petty devotion: which imaginations, as they are fram'd out of good intentions, so have they many weaknesses, and little or no doctrin in them. Conformable to this we may conceive that, after there were no more *Prophets* among the *Jews*, (who fail'd them, not long after the second building of their *Temple*) the *Rabbins* began to frame explications on their Books of holy *Scripture*, and the mysteries learn'd from the *Prophets*. These interpretations, according to the degree of their skil and prudence, some perform'd better, some worse. But, as the Jews were a superstitious and ignorant Nation, not having principles

of

of true knowledg naked before their Eys, but wrapt up in Metaphors and Allegories; all together went among them for found Law. Til, after our Saviours time, and the disperſion of that generation, ſome fooliſh knave, to give authority to this meſs of good and bad jumbled together, invented the ſtory how *Moſes* had deliver'd this doctrin to the *Sanhedrin*, and they had conſerv'd it, by *traditional* conveyances from Father to Son. A ſtory as impoſſible and incredible, to one who penetrates into the carriage of that Nation, as the Fables of *Jeoffrey of Monmouth*, and King *Arthur's* conquering *Hieruſalem*.

Now, if we look into the *form*, we ſhal find it more ridiculous then any *Gypſes* canting, or the jugling of *Hocus Pocus*, and as pernicious to true Doctrin, as any *Pſeudomancy*. To make good this cenſure, I ſhal in ſhort deſcribe their form: it conſiſts in inventing the *ſenſe* of Scripture by three abuſes of the *Letter*, which (as far as my memory ſervs me, for I have not the books neceſſary) are theſe. One by taking every letter of a word, for a whole word beginning with that letter: Another, by changing letters, according to certain rules fram'd by themſelvs: The third, to find numbers of years or other things, by the numbers which

the letters of the word compound, in ſuch Languages where their letters are uſed for cyphers. So much being deliver'd in ſhort, I cannot conceive any indifferent judgment ſo blunt, that he ſees not how far theſe ridling ways of explication are from the natural intention of a Writer; and how deſtructive to all truth, if uſed otherwiſe then for pleaſure and as a diſport of chance and encounter. Our Country man, Doctor *Alablaſter*, invented a far more convenient trick, by purely dividing words and joyning the ends of the former to the beginnings of the following: as we alſo do, ſomtimes in Engliſh, to diſguiſe common words; and the Hebrew is far more apt for ſuch knacks. But he found this age too ſubtle, to cozen any conſiderable number with ſuch trivial bables: Wheras the *Cabala* gain'd upon the *Valentinians* and *Gnoſticks*, to build prodigious errours, in very good earneſt, upon their more ridiculous invention. I am not ignorant ſome eminent perſons have been pleaſed ſomtime, to give way to ſuch toyes, through luxury of wit and gayety of humour: But it is one thing to play for recreation, and a far different to eſtabliſh a *Baſis* of Faith and doctrin, which is abominable, on ſuch Chimerical dreams. And yet, this it is our Oppoſer would Father

ther, upon no leſs then *Moſes* and the *Sanhedrin* and all the ſacred Magiſtracy of the old *Law*.

Let us give a ſtep farther and ſee, if it were true, how like it were to our caſe. The *Tradition* we ſpeak of, is the publick preaching and teaching and practice exerciſed in the Church, ſetled by the Apoſtles thorow the World: This *Cabala*, a doctrin pretended, as deliver'd to few, with ſtrict charge to keep it from publicity, and ſo communicate it again ſucceſſively to a ſelect Committee of a few; wherin you may ſee as fair an opportunity for jugling and cozenage, as, in our caſe there is impoſſibility. The *Moderns* therfore, who profeſs *Cabala*, may ſay they receiv'd it from their predeceſſors: but they can yeild no account why any Age may not have chang'd that which was in the breaſts of few ſhut up together in a chamber; and ſo ther's no poſſibility of farther aſſurance, then the vote of a Council of State, for its being deriv'd any higher.

But the Arguer demands, whether they cannot ask me, In what age or year their doctrin was corrupted? And I anſwer, they may very boldly: But, if I aſſign an age or year, can they acquit themſelvs in point of proof? clearly they cannot: for, ſince there

was

was no Regiſter nor viſible effects of this doctrin (it being forbidden to be divulg'd) 'tis evident, *that* cannot convince it was not corrupted in that year or age. He urges farther, the notoriouſneſs of the ly, ſo impudent as few would venture on: not reflecting that he ſpeaks of a ſecret, altogether incapable of notoriouſneſs. May not they add, ſays he, the diſperſion of their Churches through ſo many Countries and Languages? I yeild they may, but to no purpoſe, unleſs they continue *Sanhedrins* in every Country: For otherwiſe, this diſperſion will prove but the derivation from their Council of *Tiberias*, or ſuch like time, which is nothing to the ſucceſſion from *Moſes*. Add to this, that the Nation ſince Chriſts time, is infamous for falſifying doctrins and corrupting Scriptures: and, even in our Saviours time and long before, their *Rabbins* were juſtly branded with the foul imputation of frequent forgery; their Sects and hereſies being grown up to that deſperate height, as to deny there were any ſpirits, or ſhall be any Reſurrection, which is the very top of impiety.

But (what is no leſs to be conſider'd, then any thing yet offer'd) the very ſubject of the queſtion is different. The *Church*, we ſpeak of, is a vaſt and numerous body, ſpread

o're

o're the world; and he must be a mad man that would go about to deny this *Body* has remain'd perpetually visible, from Christs time to ours: however some Heretick may pretend the invisible part, *viz.* that the *Faith* has been interrupted. But, for the *Sanhedrin*, what assurance, nay what probability is there of deriving its pedegree, from *Moses* to the daies of our *Saviour*? In all their oppressions during the time of the *Judges*, in the division of the *Tribes*, in the raign of their *Kings*, in the captivity, first of the ten, then of the two other *Tribes*, very little mention of any such Magistrate, much less evidence of a perfect continuance. How far then, are we from having any certainty of a doctrin's succession, by them, of whom 'tis very obscure, whither any such persons were or no?

A third objection is collected, from the natural proness in Mankind to conserve *Tradition*; by which they intend to shew Religion is corrupted: Wherin you may note the force of wit and Logick, to draw arguments against a truth, even out of these very causes, which are made to conserve the truth impugned. The arguments are three. First, that divers Fathers, for zeal to the received doctrin, were very earnest against the belief of the *Antipodes*, which, now, is an ordi-

nary

ocular certainty. That divers Fathers did oppoſe that doctrin, I willingly grant: but that it was for zeal to Religion, and not through the opinion of abſurdity in Philoſophy, I am not ſatisfy'd, nor does the Author bring any proof. I remember they object, as absurd, that men ſhould ſtand feet to feet; I remember they conceit thoſe under us would fal into heaven; for the reſt, ſome places of Scripture are alledg'd; ſo that, not out of zeal to Tradition, but through misunderſtanding the Scripture, they fel into this errour. Yet I deny not there may, perhaps, be ſome argument out of Religion; as men confirm their opinions from all they can.

The ſecond proof, I imagin touches the Hiſtory of *Virgilius*; who, for a like opinion, is reported to have loſt his Biſhoprick. But 'tis a miſtake; for that holy man was no Biſhop when he was charg'd with this errour, That he held there was another Sun and Moon, belonging to the hemiſphere oppoſite to us, and a new world; nor is it certain, whether truly he thought ſo, or recanted, or was falſly accuſ'd; but wel known he was afterward made Biſhop, and lived and dyed with opinion of ſanctity.

But though the two firſt proofs are ſlender, the third wil require more ſtrength to

reſiſt it; and therfore 'tis eſpecially recommended to the Reader, to look on the place: it being in a Council and our own proper confeſſion, and ſo apparently ſtrong and altogether inſoluble; if the Author be *inexpugnabilis Dialecticus*, as well as St. *Auguſtine*, in his *Burleſque* phraſe.

Thus then begins this Onſet, which our Adverſary manages with as much civility as ſtrength. I wil alſo deſire you (ſays he) to look into the 584. *Page* of the *Florentine Council*, ſet out by *Binius*: and there you wil find, that the *Latins* confeſs they added to the Creed, *the proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt from the Son*, becauſe the contrary opinion ſeem'd to them, by conſequence, oppoſite to a confes'd Tradition of Chriſts eternal Divinity: which yet appears by what Cardinal *Perron* has excellently ſhown, not to be contradictory to Faith, but that this conſequence was ill drawn: which may have been in other points too, and ſo have brought in no ſmal number of errours; ſince neither was their Logick certain to conclude better, nor were they leſs apt to add to their Creeds accordingly, at any other times, then they were at that. Thus far the charge: And I have been obſequious to ſo ingenious a requeſt; as wil, I hope, appear by my anſwer, if I firſt waſh my hands from *Cardinal Perron*,

ron, with whom I do not engage: nor need I, ſince the *Council* has age and can ſpeak for it ſelf. As alſo, by the way, note that, ſince the addition of *Filióque*, (which was about the year 440, in St. *Leo*'s time) there has not any tittle been added to the Churches Creed; though very many Hereſies have been condemn'd. So that the Objector is forward in his aſſertions, without ſeconding them with ſolid proofs.

To come now to the Combate, I doubt much he, who was ſo ſollicitous to have me look into the Council, was not ſo careful as to caſt an eye upon it himſelf: Elſe he would have found, the queſtion had not been of *adding* the words *Filióque*, or ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ, but of the *uſing* them; the *adding* having been for the controverſy with *Photius*, the *uſing* for the expreſſion of our belief; which the Council ſays, conſiſts in two points; Firſt, that the Divinity is the *ſame* in all the three Perſons; that is, there is not three Divinities in three Perſons, nor yet one Divinity from which the Perſons or Perſonalities be πράγμασι different, and not λόγῳ μόνον τῇ ἐννοίᾳ. The Second, that none ſhould have any cauſe to ſuſpect the holy Ghoſt to be ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς. Wherfore, the inſufficiency of the conſequence, which (he ſays) Cardinal *Perron* demonſtrates, is not to our purpoſe;

no ſuch inference appearing in the Coun-cil: the *Latins* or *Roman Church* only profeſſing that, if the holy Ghoſt did not proceed out of the Father and the Son, as one *principium* or cauſe, then the Divinity were divided in the Father and Son, and, by conſequence, in the Holy Ghoſt too, and ſo ἐν τρίσι τμήμασι as the Council ſpeaks.

Whence, we may ſee, the Opponent miſtook the whole caſe, there being no queſtion of the cauſe of adding, but of what was expreſs'd; nor any diſpute of Chriſts Divinity, but of the *Unity* of the *Divinity* with the *Perſons* and in *it ſelf*; Nor any drawing of conſequences, but an expreſſion of Catholick doctrin; nor any ſuppoſed errour, but a truth confeſs'd both by Proteſtants and us: and finally, the words are ſaid to be uſed, to expreſs this point, that *He proceeds from the Son*; and not queſtion'd *why* the opinion is held, that He proceeds from the Son, which is far different from what we now contend about.

There is another objection, and Cardinal *Perron* made the Author, as having reported, out of *Iſidore*, that the Jews complotted together to aboliſh the book of *Wiſdom*, becauſe it ſpake too plainly of Chriſt. The ſtory the Objector himſelf wil not avouch, becauſe it would rank the Book (by him

him pretended to be *Apocryphal*) too high: yet, though it be acknowledg'd falſ, he conceives it ſtrong enough againſt us, becauſe it ſhews ſuch a thing might be done. Let us poize a little the weight of this Argument: It might have been done; therfore your Tradition may fail you. Firſt I demand, how you prove it might have been done; becauſe *Iſidore* ſaid it was done. The *Spaniſh* Conquerors, when firſt they enter'd the miracles of the Weſtern World, reported, They climb'd up great hils in the Sea: Therfore was it poſſible? They talk't much of waters which reſtor'd Youth: Therfore is it credible? But *Iſidore's* authority convinces this. If it were *Iſidore* the holy Biſhop of *Sevil*, ſomthing were ſaid: But 'tis *Iſidore*, ſurnamed *Mercator*, one that collects and patches together truths and falſities, almoſt indifferently; at leaſt our men ſpare not to reject him in matters of great moment. Thus the bare poſſibility, *that it might have been done*, is not, it ſelf, yet, ſufficiently prov'd.

But let us paſs that, and, without much ſtraining our charity, grant among Jews it might have been done, as not a few think the very Law was loſt in the times of their wicked Kings or other oppreſſions: what inference can they make againſt Chriſtian Tradition? Of Books of Scripture, peradventure

venture there was a time, when ſome one, or rather any one might have been loſt; becauſe it was in few hands: ſhall we therfore conclude the ſame poſſibility of ſuppreſſion, when we treat of Doctrins univerſally profeſt by ſo many Millions? when we diſpute of Practices every day frequented by the whole Church.

Stil ther's one jarring ſtring, that grates my ears with its loud diſcord; though the ſtroak come not from the hand of theſe objectors, yet I wil endeavour to put it in tune. Some ſick heads roving up and down in their extravagant phanſies wil needs entertain a wild conjecture, that at firſt our Saviour was indeed ſtil'd God, and though the learned, who had the knack of diſtinguiſhing, knew wel enough the inward meaning then ſignify'd only a moſt eminent aud godlike perſon, yet the common People underſtanding their Preacher ſimply, as the letter ſounded, came by degrees univerſally to believe his true and real divinity. But with what ingenuity can ſuch rambling wits think the chief Principle of Chriſtianity ſhould be ſo negligently taught? or accuſe ſo many holy Saints of thoſe pureſt times to be ſuch deceitful Teachers? Beſides, did not their raſhneſs blind them, they would eaſily ſee the raiſing the Perſon of Chriſt,

from

from humane to divine, would neceſſarily infer a notorious change in the ſolemn Prayers of the Church and daily devotion of the People, which certainly would give ſo great a ſtroak to both, it could not poſſibly be attempted, either undiſcern'd or unreſiſted. Laſtly the Chriſtian Faith being delivered not in a ſet form of words, but in ſenſe a thouſand ways explicated & enforc'd according to the variety of occaſions and capacity of the learners: how can any ambiguity of phraſe endanger them into a miſtake, who attend not ſo much to the dead letter, as the quickning ſenſe, ſo variouſly expreſt, ſo often incultated to them by their maſters?

THE FIFTEENTH ENCOUNTER,

Declaring the ſtate of this Queſtion, Whether the Scripture can decide controverſies?

THere remains yet a ſecond part of our *Apology*; for, as this is the Catholicks principle to adhere to the authority of the Church, that is, to the living word written in their Breaſts, which governs all their actions relating to religion: ſo on the other ſide,

ſide, whoever have at any time, (under the pretence of reformation) oppoſ'd her Authority, ſuch have conſtantly rais'd up their Altar againſt Tradition, upon the dead letter of the Scriptures: Which, as the Catholick Church highly reverences, when they are animated by the interpretation of Tradition; ſo, by too much experience, ſhe knows they become a killing letter, when abus'd, againſt the Catholick ſenſe, in the mouths of the Devil and his Miniſters.

But, before we ſet our feet within the liſts, I am bound to take notice of an oppoſition, no leſs common then ſlight and abſurd: and this it is. When we retire to *Tradition*, after both parties have loſt their breath in beating the aerial outſide of Scripture, they preſently cry out, Cannot *Ariſtotle*, cannot *Plato* make themſelvs be underſtood? why then ſhould not the *Bible*, as wel, determine Controverſies? If this were not after ſixteen hundred years of experience, after ſo much pains of our own, ſince *Luthers* time, idly caſt away, in toſſing the windy balls of empty words, without coming to reſolution of any one point, peradventure it were pardonable: but now, alas, what can it be, but an obſtinate deſire of darkneſs and a contempt of Gods Law and truth, by a bold and irrational aſſertion and loud clamours

clamours to beat down the Catholick Church; like *Dametas* in the Poem, ſtriking with both hands and his whole ſtrength, but winking all the while?

Let us, therfore open our Eys and look thorow this objection, *Cannot Plato and Ariſtotle make themſelvs be underſtood?* Yes; but what then? *Ergo* the Scripture can determine controverſies? The ſuppoſition wherin all venom ly's is conceal'd; which thus I diſplay: As *Ariſtotle* wrote of *Phyſicks* and *Metaphyſicks*, ſo the Scripture was written of thoſe controverſies which ſince are riſen among Chriſtians: But *Plato* and *Ariſtotle* can make themſelvs be underſtood concerning thoſe Sciences: therfore the *Scripture* can do as much concerning theſe Controverſies. This ought to be the diſcourſe. But had it been cloth'd in ſo thin and tranſparent a dreſs, the Authors would have bluſht to thruſt it into light: For, tis a moſt ſhameleſs Propoſition, to ſay the *Scriptures* were written of the Controverſies, long after their date, ſprung up in the Chriſtian world.

Beginning from *Geneſis* to the *Apocalyps*, let them name one Book, whoſe theme is any, now-controverted, Point betwixt Proteſtants and Catholiks. Tis true, the intent and extrinſical end of writing St.

Johns

Johns Gospel was, to shew the Godhead of Christ, which the *Arians* afterward deny'd, but that is not so directly his theme, as the miraculous life of our Saviour, from whence the Divinity of his Person was to be deduc'd: and yet the design so unsuccessful, that never any Heresy was more powerful, then that which oppos'd the truth intended by *His* Book.

But, I suppose, their reply wil be, they purpose not to say the Scripture was written of our present controversies, but of the precepts of good life and Articles of Faith necessary to them, about which our controversies arise. If this be their meaning, their Assumption is as ridiculous, as, in the other, their *Major* or chief Proposition. For, their argument must be framed thus. As Scripture was written of the necessaries to good life; so *Aristotle* and *Plato*, of Physicks and Metaphysicks: But *Aristotle* and *Plato* writ so plainly, that all questions, rising about their doctrin, can be declared out of their words: therfore all questions relating to good life, may also be clear'd out of Scriptures. Wherin the *Minor* is so ridiculous to any that have but open'd a Book of Philosophy, that 'tis enough, not only to disanul the proof, but discredit the Author.

And

And yet were it true, the conſequence would not hold: For whoever conſiders what belongs to the explication of Authors, knows, there is a great advantage to diſcern the ſenſe of thoſe who proceed ſcientifically, above the means to underſtand one that writes looſe Sentences. An *Archimedes*, an *Euclid*, a *Vitruvius* wil be of far eaſier interpretation, where the Subject is of equal facility, then a *Theognis*, *Phocyllides*, or *Antoninus*, becauſe the antecedents and conſequents do, for the moſt part, force a ſenſe on the middle propoſitions, of themſelvs ambiguous. Now, the works of *Plato* and *Ariſtotle* are generally penn'd, though not always ſo rigorouſly, yet ſtil with an approach to the Mathematical way: The Scripture uſes a quite different method, delivering its precepts without connexion betwixt one another. And though I deny not but, peradventure, the Articles of our belief have, in themſelvs as much connexion, as the ſevereſt diſcourſes of thoſe Philoſophers: yet the ſtyle, wherin they are couch'd in the Bible, is accommodated to vulgar capacities, and the delivery by way of plain and direct affirmation, without attending to the artificial rules of demonſtration.

But, becauſe no controverſy can be clear and fit for deciſion, unleſs it be prepar'd by an

an exact and rigorous ſtating the Queſtion; I firſt intend to ſet down my own ſentiment, which I conceive is alſo that of the Catholick Church: and afterward what I collect to be the opinion of my Adverſaries; leaving them this free and juſt liberty, to correct me if I miſtake their mind.

Firſt then, we Catholiks no way doubt but the Scripture is the word of God, and of infallible truth, if rightly underſtood: and that whoever, being out of the Church, receives the Scripture in that quality; the ground of ſuch reception (if rational) can be no other, then becauſe we taught him ſo, and deliver'd it to him, as ſuch. For I do not intend to diſpute againſt thoſe *Spiritati*, who, by an Enthuſiaſtical light, can judge of Scripture without ſenſe and reaſon: And, to thoſe, who pretend either Fathers or other Chriſtians out of our Church, I anſwer, my meaning is to comprehend in *our* Church the Fathers; for ſo goes our poſition; and conſequently all *Sects* either receiv'd the Scripture immediately from us, or from thoſe who received it from us.

Secondly, we doubt not but the Scripture is highly profitable, for the enablement of Preachers to teach, reprove, confirm, in all points of Catholik doctrin, both concerning Speculation and Practice: and by conſequence

ſequence that the Church were not ſo thoroughly furniſht for all kind of exigencies without it; for which reaſon it is of particular uſefulneſs, and indeed neceſſity to the Church.

Thirdly, we confeſſe the Bible contains all parts of Catholik Doctrine, in this ſenſe, that all Catholik doctrin may be found there, by places and arguments be deducted thence, nay more, be topically or Oratorially proved out of it: ſo that, if an *able* Preacher be in a Pulpit, where he ſpeaks without contradiction, with a full and free ſcope; he may, meerly diſcourſing out of Scripture, carry any point of Catholik doctrin before the generality of his Auditory, and convince at the preſent ſuch a part of them, as either are but indifferently ſpeculative, or have not taken pains in the queſtion.

Fourthly, I affirm, that if any point be brought to an *eriſticall* deciſion before Judges, where the parties on both ſides are obſtinately bent to defend their own poſitions, by all the art they can imagin: ſo the queſtion be not, which part is true, but only which is more or leſs conformable to Scripture; the Catholik poſition may be victoriouſly evidenced, by arguments purely drawn from thence, compared and valued according to

true

true *Criticiſm*; without ayd of Fathers, explications, or any other extrinſecal helps. Thus far I eſteem all good Catholiks ought to hold; and believe that all, κατὰ πάντα ὀρθοτρεπόμενος, doe, *de facto*, hold.

Now then, to come to the true difference betwixt our Adverſaries and us: I underſtand it conſiſts in this, That having ſtated a material point, (as whether that which we ſee and touch in the *Euchariſt* be truly Chriſts body, or only a figure of it, it ſelf remaining ſubſtantially Bread) and that this queſtion be to be handled contentiouſly before Judges, each party pretending to convince and demonſtrate, by quotation of places critically exalted to their higheſt force: whether the Scripture (I ſay) be a ſufficient Storehouſe to furniſh either ſide with Texts, unavoidable and convincing beyond any ſhadow of reply; in the judgement of ſworn and expert judges, who are wel practis'd what *convincing* ſignifies, and how much the various acceptions of words and mutability of meanings import in the conſtruction of ſentences. This is that wherin I engage the Catholik Negative; and ſuppoſe all Adverſaries muſt hold the Affirmative.

And the firſt reaſon of my ſuppoſition is, becauſe I never ſee them attempt any other way

way of diſputing, but out of Scripture: nor yet, in that, do they uſe ſo fair play, as to put the places which favour them on the page of receipts, and thoſe which Catholiks bring to the contrary upon that of expences; and then having by rules of good Criticiſm examined the qualities of both, preſer that party which is more deſerving.

Next, I know not how that man dare ſhew his face before any perſon of common ſenſe, who ſhal firſt acknowledg he goes againſt the opinion of the whole preſent Age wherin he lives, againſt the undoubted teſtimony of a thouſand years before him, againſt the known laws both ſpiritual and temporal, publikely renouncing all obedience to all kinds of Magiſtrate, empower'd by God and Man with juſt authority to conſerve thoſe laws; that ſhal accuſe all his kindred, Anceſtors, and whole Country of blindneſs and ignorance, and pretend all the world is bound to deſert them and follow him: and this in a matter, concerning no leſs an intereſt then Eternity: and after all this ſo arrogant bawling and high demands, being ask'd what evidence, what proof he can bring to introduce ſo great a mutation in the world, ſhal be forc'd to confeſs, he can but play at croſs and pile with them, to

know

know which of the two ſentences is true, which falſ. For, ſetting aſide real and irrefragable conviction, what is there left in ſpeculation, but meer contingency?

Now this ſtrange boldneſs, this incredible preſumption was undeniably *Luthers* caſe: and if his, then certainly all his followers: For, neither is the weight and authority of ſo many ages become leſs preſſing and efficacious againſt his adherents, nor their firſt plea improved or amended, but rather weaken'd: if by his and all his fellows labours, as yet no evidence is produced (an infallible ſign none is likely ever to be made:) Nor is the change of temporal laws and Princes any motive, to him that goes upon pure reaſon, and ſeriouſly ayms at the good of his ſoul.

Again, he whoſe diſcourſ is not convincing, and yet wil be medling with truths of higheſt importance, is either ignorant of that defect, and then he deſerves the name of a raſh temerarious fellow that dares, in a matter of ſuch conſequence advance Propoſitions (by paſſion or precipitation) whoſe quality himſelf underſtands not: or elſe he knows he does not convince; then let him at the beginning of his Sermon expreſs ſo much, and tel his Auditors, he is come to ſpeak to them concerning their ſalvation, and

and propoſe new Tenets about it; but, in very deed, he can neither prove the old Tenets are falſe, nor thoſe which he ſhall propoſe, to be true: Can any one think, if the Auditory have either wit enough to diſcover ſo groſſe an Impoſtor, or never ſo little honeſty to care what becoms of their ſouls, or love to Chriſtianity; they wil not with great indignation pull his *jump* o're his eares, and tumble him out of his Pulpit? Now what difference is there (ſo the miſchief be done) whether it be foretold the people or no; ſaving that, to conceal the wrong, is a more wicked and deſtructive piece of cunning?

Another conſideration is, that *in practical things*, more probability approaches to certainty, and, by multiplication, contingencie at laſt begets perfect Neceſſity; but, in *ſpeculation*, not ſo. For, as there is more probability to throw ſeven upon two dice, in forty trials then in foure: ſo, in five hundred, moſt certainly that cannot fail to be the caſt: the reaſon is, becauſe the number of caſting ſo exceeds the variety of *chances*, that it makes firſt a difficulty, and after an impoſſibility of miſſing. Now, in *ſpeculation*, if no particular cauſe preciſely compel, and determine the effect, variety can prevail nothing; ſo that, rigorouſly ſpea-

king a concluſion is no neerer being true, for a hundred unconvincing Arguments, then for one: whence it follows, where there is no demonſtration, neither Opinion is ſecurely the better. He therfore that pretends the introduction of a change in a ſpeculative point, ought either to promiſe evidence and conviction, or elſe content himſelf with ſilence: for 'tis abſurd to move any one to change his *aſſent* (I ſpeak not here of a *practicall reſolution*) without promiſing him ſome abetterment.

Laſtly, as far as I can penetrate, he that has a changeable and uncertain Religion, has none at all. For, I conceive a Religion (as we now diſcourſe of it) is the knowledge by which we are to guide our ſelves in our way and progreſs towards eternal felicity: ſo that, if the Religion any one profeſſes be not the true, he cannot by its principles perform what is requiſite to the gaining of that end: Neither is any knowledge which ſuch a *Probabliſt* has, the right and proper means of cultivating his ſoul in order to future happineſs; and therfore it is as impoſſible an untrue Religion ſhould lead to Heaven, as a falſ way, to London. Now, if a Religion that is not true, be no Religion, he that doubts whether he has the true, is in doubt whether he has any Religion or none; and

and he that pretends no farther then to doubt about Religion, pretends not to know he has any; but, the act of *knowing* cannot be had, if he that has it, does not know he has it; therfore he that pretends not to know he has a Religion, confesses himself to have none.

The same is clear in practice. For suppose an Apothecary had compos'd a drug for his Patient; but being incertain whether to administer it like a potion or a glister, should sometimes give it one way, sometimes the other: or a Guide, having undertaken to conduct a Stranger thorow some untroden Wildernes, & for want of assurance which way to take, should lead him up and down as in a Maze, first to the left hand, then to the right: were not these excellent Masters in their crafts, and worthy of continual imployment; but with this condition, that they practised their Arts upon none but one another? Then, if Religion be the knowledge of conducting our souls to heaven; is not he like to make good speed, that acknowledges himself incertain of the way? who to day marches forwards, and to morrow goes as much backward; to day *confesses* and *adores* Christ in the *Eucharist*, to morrow blasphemes him, and damns all that adore him; to day *prays to*

Saints, bears reſpect to a *Crucifix*, and a compaſſion to the *dead*, to morrow cries out againſt all, as Idolatry, Superſtition, and meer inventions of lucre?

Still there remains with me one other ſcruple about this point. Divers great Brains have undertaken the commendations of things, which mankind, is ſo far from delighting in, that very few can endure them; (this averſion riſing out of a judgement, not taken up by humour, but taught by nature, which juſtly abhors all that diminiſhes or deſtroys its being), as *Blindneſs*, *Folly*, *Sickneſs*, and the like: and contrived many perſwaſive forms and witty inducements, to invegle their Auditory into an evident abſurdity. Others we find, who, by whole Sects, maintain'd that all propoſitions were indifferent; and their practice was, of every ſubject to ſpeak copiouſly and plauſibly on both ſides: and this in good earneſt, out of a ſetled belief that they could make which ſide they pleaſd the more probable. I ask then, whether the probability either of theſe two ſorts of wits bring for their paradoxes, be ſufficient to chuſe a point in Religion? If you ſay, I; What imports it in any point which part you take, that is, whether you have any Religion or none? If you ſay, no; what means

means do you prescribe us to know when a probability is great enough; or, who's he that is able to judge the degrees of probability, when they are sufficient, and when not?

Peradventure you may say, In the first case, the evidence of nature shews their probability to be clearly absurd: and I could answer, why may not Nature sometimes be deceiv'd, as *Anaxagoras* would perswade us, when he maintain'd Snow was black? but I need not; 'Tis enough to remember, The questions of Religion are concerning actions whose effects appear not to us; and yet, ordinarily the effects are the chief means to frame arguments, and produce certainty, in practice, that the cause is right. 'Tis enough to remember eternall blisse belongs to the next world; and the Mysterys we dispute, are such as the Son of God only has seen and brought us tydings of. But, what wil you say to the second sort of disputers, who equall all probabilities; and are men, against whose eloquence, erudition, and prudence in other things, you cannot except? To all this I can yet add one plain but very considerable reflexion; that certainly, to prove any position, those wild capricious Brains cannot find weaker *places* for their arguments, then a mute, ambiguous, dead writing, not quickned with reason and discourse:

courſe: which yet, is the boaſted ground of all that renounce the infallibility of the Church, in matters of ſupernaturall belief.

THE SIXTEENTH ENCOUNTER.

Examining five Texts brought for the ſufficiency of Scripture.

THe caſe thus ſtated, we have won the field: If I have err'd in framing the queſtion, let them correct it, with theſe two conditions, that they propoſe it ſo, as to leave themſelves a *Religion*, and *different* from ours: for unleſs both theſe ſubſiſt, the quarrel betwixt us is at an end. But if I have rightly expreſt the point in controverſie, let them bring one place of Scripture that comes home to the queſtion, and carry the Bays. Their poſition muſt include theſe two branches: That Scripture is intended for a ground to decide Controverſies in ſuch a contentious way as I have ſet down: and ſufficient to perform this charge. For the former I dare confidently affirm, there is not in the whole Bible an expreſſion ſo much as glances towards it. And though the

the ſecond includes the firſt, and can have no verity nor ſubſiſtence without it; yet ſince there are ſome who diſcovering not the firſt, can perſwade themſelves they finde the ſecond, we wil try how ſolidly they proceed.

Firſt then, they cite certain Texts in which they ſay, *the Scripture gives us ſalvation:* But there is a wide difference betwixt giving ſalvation, and being the whol means or adequat cauſe of it, which is the point to be maintain'd, if they wil prove the Scripture ſufficient; elſe all Faith, Sacraments, good works, preaching, &c. muſt be abſolutely excluded as unneceſſary, ſince of every one of them may be ſaid, it gives ſalvation. Whence in common already appears theſe arguments are ſo weak and defective, they carry not half way home to our queſtion: Yet let's ſee at leaſt how far they reach.

In the fifth of St. *John*, Chriſt bids the Jews *ſearch the Scriptures, becauſe you think* (ſaith he) *you have eternal life in them.* Our Saviour was diſcourſing there of ſuch as bore witneſs to him: and having nam'd his Father and St. *John*, at laſt he deſcends to the Scripture and tells them to this purpoſe, You think to have life in the Scriptures; though you deceive your ſelvs in that

"that opinion; for you have only the kil-
"ling letter, and not the verifying ſpirit:
"Nevertheleſs ſearch them, for they bear
"witneſs that I am the true life, to whom
"you will not through want of charity
"and love of God have recourſ to ſeek it.
"Therfore you refuſe me, who come in the
"name of my Father, a ſign of Truth, be-
"cauſe I ſeek not mine own intereſt: But
"you will receive Antichriſt or ſome
"other who ſhall come in his own name,
"which is a mark of deceit and falſhood,
"ſo perverſ are you. This is our Saviours
diſcourſ: of all which to this argument
belong only theſe words, *You think you have life in the Scriptures*; that is, (if I underſtand the Text) you deceive your ſelvs, if you think you have life in them; which ſurely muſt needs be a very ſtrong reaſon to prove, Scriptures give ſalvation: though if the queſtion were not of the Text, I ſhould make no difficulty of the concluſion.

And it may be noted that our Saviour deſcends to the proof of Scripture, in the laſt place: putting *Miracles* the firſt, as motives able to convert *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*: in the ſecond *Preaching*, ſpecially they ſhewing ſome good affection to their Preacher St. *John*: Laſtly, the mute words of Scripture. And as for St. *John*, our *Saviour* expreſly

preſly ſays he cites him, in condeſcendence to them, that they might be the rather moved to embrace the truth, by that eſteem they had already entertain'd of their Preacher. Wheras for Scripture there was only their own conceit, which our *Saviour* ſeems to reprove as an humourſom and froward obſtinacy, that they would not be convinc'd by the palpable demonſtration of his *Miracles* (the eaſieſt and ſureſt way) nor reſt upon the preaching of his *Precurſor*, whom themſelvs confeſs to be a Prophet; nor laſtly make a diligent ſearch without prejudice, into *Scripture*, which, if interpreted with charity and humility, might have led them to him and ſalvation.

The next place is *John* 20. *Theſe things are written that you may belive that Jeſus is the Son of God, and believing may have life in his name.* Tis true both Scripture and Faith give life; but not the leaſt mention made here of any ſuch quality in either of them. This only is declar'd that the end of St. *John's* writing the Goſpel was not to make a compleat Hiſtory either of our *Saviours* Acts or doctrin; but only to ſpecify ſuch particulars as prove that Chriſt was the true conſubſtantial Son of God: to keep them out of the Hereſy then beginning to riſe, that they might continue true belie-

vers

vers in the Church of God, live according to its Rules and be ſaved by ſo living, that is, by being true *Chriſtians* or *Jeſuits*; which is certainly the ſenſe of theſe words, *in his name*, or, *in the name of Jeſus*, as to be baptiz'd in the name of *Jeſus*, ſignify's to be enroll'd among the company known to be *his*.

Now from this Text we may clearly collect that St. *Johns* Goſpel was not written by the Authors intention for any ſuch end as the argument urges: Nor, that it gives life, more then this one Article does, that *Jeſus is the true Son of God*; Nor yet that this Article gives life, but that life is to be had in the name of Chriſt, whatever theſe words ſignify: Only it may be infer'd that life cannot be had without this Article; but not that this alone is able to give life, or that it cannot be believ'd without St. *Johns Goſpel*, or that St. *Johns Goſpel* of it ſelf is ſufficient to give life without the concurrence of *Tradition*. So that there is no appearance from this propoſition that life either can be attain'd by Scripture *alone*, or cannot be had *without* it.

The third Text is out of 2 *Tim.* chap. 3. That the *Scriptures are able to make him wiſe to ſalvation through the faith of Jeſus Chriſt*. The paraphraſe of the place, as I underſtand

it

it, is, *O Timothy!* be conſtant in the doctrin I have taught thee; and this for two reaſons; One common to all converted by me, becauſe thou knoweſt who I am that deliver'd it to thee; This is the firſt and principal reaſon, *the authority of the Teacher*: Another peculiar to thee, becauſe from thy infancy, thou art vers'd in the holy Scriptures, which are proper to make thee wiſe and underſtanding in the law of *Jeſus Chriſt*, or to promote and improve thy ſalvation, which is obtained by the faith of *Jeſus*. So that, he ſpeaks not of *Timothy's* becomming a Chriſtian, but his becomming a through furniſht (or extraordinary) Chriſtian, a Doctor and Preacher.

And the ground on which I build this explication is derived from the words following, where the Apoſtle expreſſes this vertue of the *Scriptures* being *profitable to teach and reprove*; as alſo from this conſideration that the ſequel, *Be conſtant to my words or Doctrin, becauſe the Scripture can teach thee the truth of Chriſts doctrin*, is not very exact, but rather oppoſite to the former, and plainly inducing the contrary; as if one ſhould argue, Follow not my doctrin, becauſe mine, but becauſe the Scripture teaches thee it: which directly contradicts the intention of the Apoſtle, as appears in the verſ immediatly

diatly precedent, *Be ſtedfaſt in thoſe things thou haſt learnt, knowing by whom thou wert inſtructed*; wheras this other diſcourſe is perfectly conſequential, Stand to my doctrin becauſe the Scripture confirms and ſeconds it, making thee able to defend and prove by arguments, what I have ſimply taught thee to be true, by the ſole evidence of *Miracles*, which beget *Faith*, not Science.

But to grant our Adverſary the leſs proper ſenſe and conſequence, that the Scripture was to contribute to the ſalvation of *Timothy* himſelf; ſtill ther's an equivocation in thoſe words, *through, or by the faith of Ieſus Chriſt*: which may be refer'd to thoſe, (*to make thee underſtanding*) Either ſo, that the ſenſe be, *The Scriptures* (*in which thou haſt been vers'd ſince thy infancy*) *will contribute to thy ſalvation, ſo that thou underſtand them according to the Faith of Ieſus Chriſt which I have orally deliver'd to thee*; and this is, in direct terms, the Catholick Rule, that the interpretation of Scripture is to be govern'd by Tradition or by the faith and doctrin ſo receiv'd, and formally depends from the firſt words, *Remain conſtant to my doctrin*: Or, by another explication, which is more material and flat and moſt incredible, That the old Scripture (for of that only the Apoſtle ſpeaks, no other being written while

Timothy

Timothy was a child) ſhould be able, without relation to the knowledg of Chriſt by other means to make a man underſtanding enough to be ſaved by the Faith of Him; as may be ſeen by *St. Peters* being ſent to *Cornelius*.

So that, of theſe three ſenſes, the firſt is nothing to our adverſaries purpoſe, and nevertheleſs is the beſt; The ſecond poſitively and highly againſt him: the third incoherent to the words precedent and following, and in it ſelf, an incredible propoſition. But give it the greateſt force the words can, by any art, be heightned to, they come nothing neer the ſtate of the queſtion propoſed which concerns the deciſion of all quarrels carried on by litigious parties: Whereas this Text is content with any ſufficiency at large to bring men to ſalvation: a point not preciſely now controverted betwixt us. Beſides *Timothy* being already a Chriſtian, 'tis a pure folly to think the Apoſtle ſent him to the *Scriptures* to chuſe his Religion.

The words immediatly following the place explicated are urged for a new Argument: They are theſe: *All Scripture is inſpired from God, and profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to inſtruct in juſtice*, (that is, good life) *that the man of God become perfect, being furniſht to every good work.* The paraphraſe, accor-

according to my skil is thus, *The holy Writ I ſpake of, is any Book inſpir'd from God, and profitable to teach things unknown, reprehend what is amiſs, to ſet ſtraight what is crooked, to inſtruct in good life; that the Church of God, or any member therof, may become perfect, being, by inſtructions and reprehenſions applyed out of* Scripture, *by ſuch preachers as* Timothy, *fitted to any good work or all kinds of good works.* This I conceive the natural meaning and moſt conformable to the Text, were we to ſeek the interpretation of it indifferently, without any eye to our preſent controverſy. And in this ſenſe, 'tis a cleer caſe, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the benefit of Scripture, when explicated and apply'd by a Preacher, in order to the perfecting of thoſe that hear him.

But if, by importunity the adverſary will needs have it, that the Scripture ſhould give the quality of being ἄρτιος to the perſon himſelf that reads it; to content him, I ſhall not hinder him of his mind, but only prove it nothing to his purpoſe: For ſtill this muſt be the ſenſe, that it produces in the reader the excellencies requir'd in a Preacher, namely to make him do all thoſe good works which are expected of him; as teaching, reprehending, &c. ſo that one way or other, ſtill the Scripture is apply'd to furniſh

niſh him with Precepts, Arguments, Examples, and ſuch like inſtruments of perſwaſion: but of giving the firſt Catechiſm, or binding ones ſelf Apprentice to the *Bible*, to learn the firſt rudiments of Chriſtian profeſſion, ther's not the leaſt word or ſyllable that colours for ſuch a conceit: nor can it indeed conſiſt with the direct meaning of the place; ſince the being already a Chriſtian, is plainly ſuppos'd in *Timothy*, by St. *Pauls* inſtitutions *viva voce*, before any exhortation to this uſe of Scripture. So that, here is no queſtion concerning the firſt choyce of Faith, but of perfection after Faith: much leſs any mention of convincing in *foro contentioſo*, about which is all our controverſy.

Another place is *Acts* 26. where St. *Paul*, defending himſelf before *Agrippa* and *Feſtus*, againſt the *Jews* accuſation, who calumniated him that he ſpake in derogation of the Law, and brought in a new doctrin to the diſturbance of the people; made only this anſwer, that he preach'd nothing but what the Prophets had foretold. His words are theſe: *The Iews for this* (teaching Chriſts doctrin) *finding me in the Temple, would have kill'd me: But I having obtain'd ſuccour from God until this very day have perſiſted teſtifying* (or proteſting) *to great and little, that I ſpoke nothing*

nothing but what the Prophets and Moſes had foretold ſhould come to paſs; as, that Chriſt was to ſuffer, that he was to be the firſt ſhould riſe from death to life, and preach light both to Iews and Gentils. This is the true interpretation of the Greek Text, as far as ly's in my power to explicate it, according to the intention of St. *Paul.* I deny not but the words ſingly taken may be interpreted, *I have perſiſted teſtifying to great and little, and in my Sermons ſaying nothing but what* &c. But this explication is neither ſo proper to his defence, nor at all advances the Adverſaries cauſe: For ſince St. *Paul* tells us directly what the points are of which he ſpake; whatever can be gathered out of them, only this is ſaid, that theſe three points were foretold by *Moſes* and the Prophets: and on the other ſide, the diſcourſ is imperfect, running thus, *I preach'd indeed many other things, yet nothing but what was in Moſes and the Prophets, to wit, that Chriſt was to ſuffer,* &c. His meaning therfore is, that ſince he was in hold, his perpetual endeavours had been, to ſhew that theſe things he was accuſed to have preach'd againſt the law, were the very marrow of the *Law* and foretold by *Moſes* and the Prophets: and that, wheras the *Jews* expected Chriſt to be a temporal King, who by force of Arms ſhould reſtore the houſe

of

of *Iſrael*, to a great and flouriſhing eſtate, the truth was quite contrary; for, according to the doctrin of *Moſes* and the Prophets, He was to be a paſſible man, to ſuffer death, afterwards to riſe again triumphantly, as the firſt fruits of the Reſurrection, and to ſend his Diſciples both to Jews and Gentiles to ſpread the light of the Goſpel throughout the world.

What advantage againſt the neceſſity of *Tradition*, can be drawn out of this place of Scripture, which doth not ſo much as talk of the extent of Catholick doctrin, much leſs come within kenning of our Controverſy, is beyond my reach: This I know, that, to ſay all points of Catholick doctrin can be ſufficiently prov'd out of *Moſes* and the Prophets, is an aſſertion I believe our Adverſaries themſelvs will deny; as being both ridiculous in it ſelf and abſolutely diſcrediting the neceſſity of the new Teſtament: and yet clearly, without maintaining ſo groſs abſurdities, they can make no advantage of this Text.

THE

THE SEVENTEENTH ENCOUNTER.

Examining such places as are brought against the admittance of any, but Scriptural proof in Religion.

WE are at last come to those places in which they most glory, conceiting themselvs able by them utterly to destroy all *Traditions*: These are such as forbid to add or detract from the holy *Scriptures*: which, though commonly so explicated by Protestants, yet certainly cannot but appear to every child altogether impertinent to our controversy. For, tis a far different question, Whether we were bound to put no new or *Apocryphal* Books into the *Canon* (which our adversaries charge us to have done) or to take none out (which we charge them to do?) from that now in debate, Whether there be any other means of assuring matters of Faith, beside the Bible? or rather, Whether Scripture in an eristical and contentious way, be a Rule sufficient to decide all controverfies in Religion? Nevertheless let us see the Texts they alledge for their opinion: *Deut.* 4. 2. *Iosh.* 1. and o-

thers

thers to the ſame effect.

My firſt anſwer is; ſuppoſe theſe places imported all the force our adverſaries pretend, we are not in the leaſt degree concern'd: ſince all that's ſaid is clearly ſpoken of a certain Book or Law, properly and ſpecially belonging to the Jews: and no more obliging Chriſtians then the Book of *Leviticus* or the Law of Circumciſion.

Secondly; ſince it is held as a main diſtinction and oppoſition betwixt the Laws of the *Jew* and of the *Chriſtian*, that thoſe of the *Jew* were to be written in *Stone* and *Paper*, and thoſe of the *Chriſtian* in the *hearts of men by Tradition*: it would rather follow (if ſuch Analogy were to be made) that becauſe nothing but Scripture is to be given to the Jew, only *Tradition* is to be preſſed on the Chriſtian.

Thirdly, to the end this place may have the effect endeavoured by the arguer, all the reſt of the Bible, except *Deuteronomy* or ſuch other Book, to which the Texts cited particularly relate, may be burnt, or at leaſt caſt out of the *Canon*; and not have any power to decide controverſies, even in the Jews law. I know 'tis anſwer'd, that Proteſtants deny not ſuch Books: Neither do we accuſe them of it; only we conceive we may ſafely ſay, they contradict themſelvs,

in preſſing theſe places to that effect of one ſide, and admitting the Books on the other.

My fourth Anſwer is, that the *Law* it ſelf enjoyns in certain caſes, other precepts to be added; remitting the people upon any doubt, firſt to *Iudges*, and afterwards to the *High Prieſt*, and commanding their declarations to be obey'd, and under greateſt penalties punctually obſerv'd: So that, the conſequence drawn out of theſe places, is both weak in it ſelf and prejudicial to them that uſe it.

Nor is the inference our adverſaries wreſt out of the laſt Chapter of the *Apocalyps* leſs unreaſonable then the former: where, he that adds or detracts any thing from that Prophecy is accurſed: whence pleaſant diſcourſers will needs conclude; that Chriſtian doctrin is no otherwiſe to be proved but by Scripture. Queſtionleſs, to ſpeak more pertinently to the Text, they ſhould have ſaid, it was to be prov'd out of nothing but the *Apocalyps*: but becauſe that would appear too palpable and abſurd, they included the reſt of the Scripture violently againſt the expreſs letter and meaning of the Text. This Argument ſeems to me, as if the fam'd Aſtrologer Mr. *Lilly*, had obtain'd a Protection from the State, that none

ſhould

ſhould preſume to abuſe his *Prognoſtications*, by foyſting in counterfeit ones, or blotting out any part of his; and thence, one ſhould boldly infer that all our Courts of Juſtice were commanded to judg ſuch caſes as came before them, only out of *Lilly's Almanack*: with this ſole difference, that the arguer here unjuſtly cogs in the whole Scripture, inſtead of the ſingle Book of the *Apocalyps*, which makes his conſequence far weaker and more unexcuſable then the other; as I confeſs the ſimilitude I uſe agreeable rather to the impertinency of the objection, then to the dignity of the ſubject.

To theſe two may be paralleld that Preface of St. *Luke*, ſo ſtrongly urg'd by ſome. The words, as I underſtand them, are theſe. *Seeing many have endeavoured to compile a hiſtory of the things in great abundance acted among us; according as they who were from the beginning eye-witneſſes and inſtruments of the Goſpel, have delivered to us: I alſo have thought fit (excellent* Theophilus) *ſince I was preſent at all, things almoſt from the beginning, to ſet them down to thee in order, that thou mayeſt know the certainty of the Reports which thou haſt been taught.* This is the Text, though others interpret it otherwiſe; who (if they will urge any thing out of their own explication) muſt firſt juſtify it againſt this.

But out of this, First St. *Luke* pretends no more then to tell *our Saviours life*, like a good Historian; however some of his excellent sayings cannot be deny'd their place in his life, as is testifyed by the same St. *Luke*, in the first of the *Acts*: and therfore we ought not expect to know more from him, then was fit for an Historian to report; that is, the eminent deeds and sayings of our Saviour. Now, the end expres'd in the Text for the writing of this History may be understood two ways: One, that *Theophilus* might know which reports were true, which false: The other, that *Theophilus* out of the recital of Christs miracles and heroical actions might understand the greatnes of his person, and by consequence the certainty of his holy doctrin, which depends from them; But whether one or the other, however there is not a word that this Book should serve for a Catechism, to teach him and all the world the entire body of Christian doctrin, which must be our Adversaries meaning.

There are yet two passages I must not omit, because our Adversaries make great account of them: one is the fourth Chapter of the first to the *Corinthians*, *That you may learn in us, not to be wise beyond what is written.* To understand this place, you must know

know there grew ſome emulations betwixt the diſciples of the Apoſtles, (if I may gueſs) betwixt thoſe of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*. This St. *Paul* reprehends at large: but for fear of making the breach wider, inſtead of cloſing it, would not name St. *Peter*, chuſing rather to put the caſe, as if it had paſs'd betwixt himſelf and *Apollo*: and firſt uſes this argument, that *Paul* and *Apollo* are but Miniſters of Chriſt: therupon after ſome diverſion, he comes to tel them, how all that any man has, is from God and for the people; and concludes, to have all eſteem'd as the Miniſters of Chriſt and diſpenſators of his Myſteries: And after he has expreſs'd how little he concerns himſelf, whether he be wel or ill reputed by them, concludes, telling them he had taken thoſe two names of *Paul* and *Apollo*, to teach them this point; and then brings in the words alleadg'd, which I may venture to paraphraſe thus. *I have diſguiſ'd my diſcourſ concerning the eſteem you ought to have of your* Preachers, *under the names of* Apollo *and my ſelf; that, by what I teach you to be due to our perſons, you may learn not to be affected to your* Preachers, *above what I have written to you about a dozen lines before: to wit, that they are all ordain'd for you Miniſters of Chriſt and diſpenſers of his Myſteries; to the end one of you do not ſwell with pride*

or

or choller againſt another in any mans behalf, and ſo breed Schiſms and contentions among your ſelves.

This is the meaning of the Apoſtle; as will appear to any judicious underſtanding, that can be content to read and diligently weigh the whole compoſition of the diſcourſ. And here we are unwillingly conſtrain'd to obſerve the deſperate ſhifts of many of our adverſaries, into which either the raſhneſs of their paſſions or neceſſity of their cauſ engages them: for ſo, in the Text we now treat, they preſently ſnapt at a piece of a ſentence, where they found this charming word (*written*;) and that was enough for them, without ever troubling their heads to conſider or ſenſe or connexion in order to the framing a legitimate argument. For, had they but taken the immediatly precedent line, *Theſe I have diſguized into* Apollo *and my ſelf for you*, and then brought in the words cited, *That you may learn in us, not to be wiſe above what is written*; the nonſenſe would have declar'd it ſelf, and ſtumbled the Reader, who could not but preſently have check'd at the inconſequence. And the verſe following would be likewiſe incongruous to theſe, *that you be not ſweld one againſt another for any man*: For, what connexion can either the words precedent, or

ſub-

ſubſequent have, with this, that, You are to learn your Faith out of the Scripture? and yet I have tranſlated the Latin *Sapere* or Greek φρονῶν, againſt the true ſenſe, for the objectours advantage; wheras the true meaning is not to eſteem them higher, or bear themſelvs, as if their Maſters were higher: and thus the very Engliſh Tranſlation yeilds it.

The latter place is out of the firſt to the *Galathians*, where he warns them, that *whoever comes to preach any doctrin, beſides that which He had taught them, they ſhould refuſe him communion, or account him execrable.* This paſſage I have always eſteem'd very ſtrong and pregnant for *Tradition*; and our Adverſaries call it a moſt illuſtrious proof againſt it. I confeſs at firſt I was at a loſs to imagine how they could frame an argument out of ſo unfavourable a Text: but at laſt, I perceiv'd it might perhaps be thus, St. *Paul* (ſaid they) preach'd nothing but what was *written*, as he teſtify's to *Agrippa*; ſo then, all he preach'd was *Scripture*: But he commands them to receive no other doctrin, but what he deliver'd them: Therfore, he enjoynd them to make Scripture the Rule of their Faith. This is (as far as I can find) the full epitome of their diſcourſe upon this Text.

But

But, considering that what is in Scripture may be deliver'd by preaching, without any mention of Scripture; me thinks though all St. *Paul* taught the *Galathians* had been *written*, yet it follows not He commanded the *Galathians* to hold the doctrin from Scripture; For those two words, *what we Evangeliz'd to you*, and *what you have receiv'd*, signify so plainly *preaching*, that I can collect nothing from this place, but that they were to hold their Faith *because He had preach'd it*; then which 'tis impossible to imagine a more efficacious argument to demonstrate *Tradition*.

And, to this effect, he exaggerates his own quality; that he was one who had not receiv'd his doctrin *from man* nor by the *entermise of man*, but immediatly by revelation from Christ: and afterwards, (upbraiding the *Galathians* for their inconstancy) asks them, whether they had receiv'd their Christianity by the works of the Law, or *ex auditu fidei*, by hearing of the *Gospel?* So that, in effect, his command is to the *Galathians*, to stand to his preaching, that is, to *Tradition* for their Faith: and this not only against all men but even Angels, should they come down from Heaven to preach any thing contrary. For, that the word *præter* may signify *contrary*, is too well known to

be

be inſiſted on; But, that it ſignify's ſo here, the particular occaſion of this diſcourſe makes evident; St. *Paul* expreſſing that *ſome intruded themſelves ſeeking to overturn the Goſpel of Chriſt*: and charging upon them that, wheras they had *begun in ſpirit, they ended in fleſh*, and the like: Wherfore it is plain, he ſpake of doctrin contrary to what he had preach'd. But if *præter* be taken for *beſides*, it will ſignify *beſides Tradition*, not *beſides Scripture*: there being not the leaſt mention of Scripture: Now, how ſoundly it is proved that St. *Paul* taught nothing but what was *written*, is before examin'd; which yet if admitted true, were nothing to the purpoſe. For, 'tis not the Catholik poſition, that all its doctrins are not contain'd in Scripture: but not held from thence nor to be convinced out of the naked letter, eſpecially in a pertinacious diſpute: A queſtion certainly not ſo much as dream'd of in this place of St. *Paul*.

And now to cloſe this whole diſcourſe, I ſhall only add one ſhort period: as a prudential reflection upon the different fitneſs and proportion theſe two methods have, in order to determine controverſies. That, in caſe where any two parties diſagree, *Tradition* is very ſeldom ſo much as pretended by both, and if at all, ſtill in points of leſs importance:

But out of this, First St. *Luke* pretends no more then to tell *our Saviours life*, like a good Historian; however some of his excellent sayings cannot be deny'd their place in his life, as is testifyed by the same St. *Luke*, in the first of the *Acts*: and therfore we ought not expect to know more from him, then was fit for an Historian to report; that is, the eminent deeds and sayings of our Saviour. Now, the end expres'd in the Text for the writing of this History may be understood two ways: One, that *Theophilus* might know which reports were true, which false: The other, that *Theophilus* out of the recital of Christs miracles and heroical actions might understand the greatnes of his person, and by consequence the certainty of his holy doctrin, which depends from them; But whether one or the other, however there is not a word that this Book should serve for a Catechism, to teach him and all the world the entire body of Christian doctrin, which must be our Adversaries meaning.

There are yet two passages I must not omit, because our Adversaries make great account of them: one is the fourth Chapter of the first to the *Corinthians*, *That you may learn in us, not to be wise beyond what is written.* To understand this place, you must know

know there grew ſome emulations betwixt the diſciples of the Apoſtles, (if I may gueſs) betwixt thoſe of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*. This St. *Paul* reprehends at large: but for fear of making the breach wider, inſtead of cloſing it, would not name St. *Peter*, chuſing rather to put the caſe, as if it had paſs'd betwixt himſelf and *Apollo*: and firſt uſes this argument, that *Paul* and *Apollo* are but Miniſters of Chriſt: therupon after ſome diverſion, he comes to tel them, how all that any man has, is from God and for the people; and concludes, to have all eſteem'd as the Miniſters of Chriſt and diſpenſators of his Myſteries: And after he has expreſs'd how little he concerns himſelf, whether he be wel or ill reputed by them, concludes, telling them he had taken thoſe two names of *Paul* and *Apollo*, to teach them this point; and then brings in the words alleadg'd, which I may venture to paraphraſe thus. *I have diſguiſ'd my diſcourſ concerning the eſteem you ought to have of your* Preachers, *under the names of* Apollo *and my ſelf; that, by what I teach you to be due to our perſons, you may learn not to be affected to your* Preachers, *above what I have written to you about a dozen lines before: to wit, that they are all ordain'd for you Miniſters of Chriſt and diſpenſers of his Myſteries; to the end one of you do not ſwell with pride*

or

or choller againſt another in any mans behalf, and ſo breed Schiſms and contentions among your ſelves.

This is the meaning of the Apoſtle; as will appear to any judicious underſtanding, that can be content to read and diligently weigh the whole compoſition of the diſcourſ. And here we are unwillingly conſtrain'd to obſerve the deſperate ſhifts of many of our adverſaries, into which either the raſhneſs of their paſſions or neceſſity of their cauſ er gages them: for ſo, in the Text we now treat, they preſently ſnapt at a piece of a ſentence, where they found this charming word (*written*;) and that was enough for them, without ever troubling their heads to conſider or ſenſe or connexion in order to the framing a legitimate argument. For, had they but taken the immediatly precedent line, *Theſe I have diſguized into* Apollo *and my ſelf for you*, and then brought in the words cited, *That you may learn in us, not to be wiſe above what is written*; the nonſenſe would have declar'd it ſelf, and ſtumbled the Reader, who could not but preſently have check'd at the inconſequence. And the verſe following would be likewiſe incongruous to theſe, *that you be not ſweld one againſt another for any man:* For, what connexion can either the words precedent, or

ſub-

ſubſequent have, with this, that, You are to learn your Faith out of the Scripture? and yet I have tranſlated the Latin *Sapere* or Greek φρονεῖν, againſt the true ſenſe, for the objectours advantage; wheras the true meaning is not to eſteem them higher, or bear themſelvs, as if their Maſters were higher: and thus the very Engliſh Tranſlation yeilds it.

The latter place is out of the firſt to the *Galathians*, where he warns them, that *whoever comes to preach any doctrin, beſides that which He had taught them, they ſhould refuſe him communion, or account him execrable.* This paſſage I have always eſteem'd very ſtrong and pregnant for *Tradition*; and our Adverſaries call it a moſt illuſtrious proof againſt it. I confeſs at firſt I was at a loſs to imagine how they could frame an argument out of ſo unfavourable a Text: but at laſt, I perceiv'd it might perhaps be thus, St. *Paul* (ſaid they) preach'd nothing but what was *written*, as he teſtify's to *Agrippa*; ſo then, all he preach'd was *Scripture*: But he commands them to receive no other doctrin, but what he deliver'd them: Therfore, he enjoynd them to make Scripture the Rule of their Faith. This is (as far as I can find) the full epitome of their diſcourſe upon this Text.

But

But, considering that what is in Scripture may be deliver'd by preaching, without any mention of Scripture; me thinks though all St. *Paul* taught the *Galathians* had been *written*, yet it follows not He commanded the *Galathians* to hold the doctrin from Scripture; For those two words, *what we Evangeliz'd to you*, and *what you have receiv'd*, signify so plainly *preaching*, that I can collect nothing from this place, but that they were to hold their Faith *because He had preach'd it*; then which 'tis impossible to imagine a more efficacious argument to demonstrate *Tradition*.

And, to this effect, he exaggerates his own quality; that he was one who had not receiv'd his doctrin *from man* nor by the *entermise of man*, but immediatly by revelation from Christ: and afterwards, (upbraiding the *Galathians* for their inconstancy) asks them, whether they had receiv'd their Christianity by the works of the Law, or *ex auditu fidei*, by hearing of the *Gospel?* So that, in effect, his command is to the *Galathians*, to stand to his preaching, that is, to *Tradition* for their Faith: and this not only against all men but even Angels, should they come down from Heaven to preach any thing contrary. For, that the word *præter* may signify *contrary*, is too well known to be

be insisted on; But, that it signify's so here, the particular occasion of this discourse makes evident; St. *Paul* expressing that *some intruded themselves seeking to overturn the Gospel of Christ:* and charging upon them that, wheras they had *begun in spirit, they ended in flesh*, and the like: Wherfore it is plain, he spake of doctrin contrary to what he had preach'd. But if *præter* be taken for *besides*, it will signify *besides Tradition*, not *besides Scripture*: there being not the least mention of Scripture: Now, how soundly it is proved that St. *Paul* taught nothing but what was *written*, is before examin'd; which yet if admitted true, were nothing to the purpose. For, 'tis not the Catholik position, that all its doctrins are not contain'd in Scripture: but not held from thence nor to be convinced out of the naked letter, especially in a pertinacious dispute: A question certainly not so much as dream'd of in this place of St. *Paul*.

And now to close this whole discourse, I shall only add one short period: as a prudential reflection upon the different fitness and proportion these two methods have, in order to determine controversies. That, in case where any two parties disgree, *Tradition* is very seldom so much as pretended by both, and if at all, still in points of less importance:

portance: wheras *Scripture* is continually alledg'd by all sides, how numerous soever their factions be, and how fundamental soever their differences: An evident sign, the way of resolving by *Tradition*, is incomparably preferrable to that of judging *by the bare letter of Scripture*: especially if, still upon examination, one of the pretended opposite Traditions prove, indeed, either not sufficiently universal or not *positively* contrary to the other, but, perhaps a particular custom of some *Province*, as *Rebaptization*: or only a meer negative Tradition, as that of the *Greeks* concerning the *Holy Ghost*.

THE

THE EIGHTEENTH ENCOUNTER,

Declaring the reaſons of the Authors concluding, without proceeding to the examination of the Fathers Teſtimonies.

I Have omitted the petty quiblets of Criticiſm which our Adverſaries uſe to preſs in divers of the places I explicated: not only becauſe they are often falſ, moſt commonly ſtrain'd, and always ſuch pigmy bulruſhes, that they merit no admiſſion into a grave diſcourſ: but chiefly, becauſe, conſidering largely the Antecedents and conſequents to the Texts alledged, I found the ſubſtance of them wholly miſtaken and nothing to our purpoſe: and that ſuch arguments are the abortive iſſue of immature brains, not able to diſtinguiſh the force of Canon ſhot, from a *Faery's* ſquib or a boys pot-gun.

And I dare (had I good conditions) maintain that, in all the differences betwixt Proteſtants and us Catholicks, they cannot produce

produce one place of Scripture, in which the words can bear a ſenſe that comes home to the ſtate of the queſtion. I know many urge thoſe of the Decalogue againſt Images: To which I anſwer, with words analogical to thoſe of St. *Paul*, Who (ſpeaking to the *Galathians*) proteſted that whoever circumcis'd himſelf, as a thing neceſſary or becauſe of the old Commandment, was bound to keep the whole Judaical law: So ſay I, whoever condemns Images, upon this prohibition of *Moſes*, is bound to keep all the law of the Jews: For, if theſe words be a law to us, becauſe they are written in theirs, all that's written in their law muſt be ſo to us; ſince he that made one, made all; and, for whom he made one and deliver'd it to them, for them he made and deliver'd all the reſt, as one entire body of law to be obſerv'd by them. He therfore that counts himſelf bound by this Law, muſt (if he have common ſenſe) eſteem himſelf equally obliged to all the reſt.

Upon the ſame reaſon hangs the *keeping of the Sabbath day*; for, of all the *Decalogue*, theſe are the only two points unrepeated in the *new Teſtament*: ſo that, all the reſt we are bound to accept in vertue of that, but theſe two we cannot. Wherfore, whoever holds, *The Sabbath day is commanded by God*, either

either does so because he finds it in the *old Law*: and to him I protest he ought (in consequence to this judgment) submit to all that law and become a *Jew*: or else, because he finds it in observation among Christians, that is, in *Tradition*: and to him I protest, he is bound to embrace all that comes down by *Tradition*, namely, the whole Roman Catholick Faith: Therfore, every rigorous observer of the *Sabbath*, is bound in common sense, either to be a *Jew* or a *Catholick*.

To make an end, I know our adversaries alledg many sentences of *Fathers* to prove the sufficiency of Scripture: wherof the most part I am sure are as far beside the state of the question, as those places of Scripture we come now from examining. However, I finde my self, not concern'd to look into them: pretending no farther at this present, then to consider the ground upon which those I oppose rely, for their assurance, that Scripture is sufficient to decide controversies, according to the state of the question, as it is proposed. Now, because they reject wholly the Authority of *Fathers*, from a definitive sentence in matter of Faith: it is impossible for them, (if they are not quite *Bedlams*) to rely on their Authority for acceptance of Scripture; for what can be imagin'd

gin'd more palpably abſurd then to receive upon their credit the whole Rule of Faith, and yet not take their words for any one Article of Faith? and conſequently what can be imagin'd more vain and fruitleſs then for me to loſe my labour in ſtriving to ſhew that Proteſtants have no colour from Antiquity, to expect this al-deciding power in Scripture, whilſt themſelvs aver the whole multitude of *Fathers* is not capable of giving a ſufficient teſtimony for their relyance on Scripture: ſince therfore there is nothing like a ground in Scripture, and they ſcorn all ground except Scripture, I muſt leave them to the freedom of doing it without ground.

FINIS.

DAILLE'S ARTS DISCOVER'D:

OR,

His RIGHT USE,

Prov'd

A Down-right ABUSE

Of the

FATHERS.

By THO. WHITE, Gent.

EZECH. 13. 12.

Ecce cecidit Paries: nunquid non dicetur vobis, Ubi eſt litura quam liniſtis?

Printed in the Yeare

1654.

DAILLÈ's Arts DISCOVER'D.

THE FIRST SURVEY.

Of the nature and ſubject of Daille's *Book.*

HAving clos'd the precedent Treatiſe which this conſideration, that, ſince *Proteſtants* diſavow to be determin'd by the authority of *Fathers*, I had juſt title to decline any farther ſearch into thoſe reverend *Witneſſes* of our *ancient Faith*; being a task that would require ſome labour of me to do, and yield no profit to them, when done.

Yet, I eaſily obſerv'd, that, as my excuſe (to indifferent Perſons) will defend me from the imputation of being troubled with the Writing-Itch: ſo, it ſeems to engage my clearing my ſelf of a far more important

charge, which otherwiſe might occaſion ſome paſſionate or captious ſpirits, to fix this ſcandal upon me, that I acknowledge not the judgment of Antiquity; an injurious aſperſion, which the French *Daillè* has actually endeavour'd to caſt upon the whole *Catholik* Church, in his abuſive Treatiſe, of *the right uſe of the Fathers*.

And becauſe that *Monſieur's* Book is Denizon'd among us, by the adoption of thoſe two great *Secretaries* (whoſe names forc'd me into this imployment) and rais'd to the eſteem of being the ſource whence their ſtreams took their current; I cannot but give my *Reader* a hint concerning it: for no other reaſon, but only to make him underſtand, what *Great men* are ſubject to, when the luxuriouſneſs of their wits carries them beyond the bounds of thoſe profeſſions they are skild in.

With this Note therfore we wil begin our diſcourſe; that, Many great and nimble wits, both ancient and modern, have (meerly for their recretation) undertaken to plead the cauſe of natural defects, and ſtriven to ſet them above the oppoſite perfections: like *Æſop's Woolf*, who, having loſt his tail, would perſwade other Wolvs to cut off theirs too, as unneceſſary burdens. But, nature contradicting this Art, and by a perpe-

tual

tuall current of impreſſions, forcing us to the contrary belief; ſuch quaint diſcourſes gain no more credit then Priſmatical glaſſes, in which we are pleaſd to know our ſelvs delightfully coſen'd. Now, what in theſe men, is only a Caprich of wit and gayneſs of humor, were it applied to a buſineſs of high concern, and which could not be judg'd by our ſenſes, but requir'd a deep penetration to diſtinguiſh right from wrong, would certainly be a moſt pernicious and inſufferable wickedneſs: a trap to enſnare and ruin all the weak and unlearn'd, whom either the cunning of Logick can deceive, or ſweetneſſe of Rhetorick inveagle.

But, being arriv'd already within ſight of my deſigned Port, I beg my Reader to believe me of that diſcretion, as not eaſily to lanch forth again into the main Ocean of a new bottomleſs controverſy: and therfore I ſhall only eſſay to decipher the quality of the Treatiſe in common; leaving its ſtrict peruſal to them that are more at leiſure, and have their Noſes better arm'd for raking in a dunghil.

To make then a neerer approach to the work, I ſhal begin with the Author's intention, which aims at no leſſe then this bold and deſperate attempt, To diſable the

Fathers

Fathers from being Judges in the Controversies of this present Age. Let us enquire the true and genuine sense of this proposition.

And first, who are signifi'd by the word *Fathers*? For this he assigns us three Ages: from *Christ* to *Constantine*; from *Constantine* to *Gregory* the great; and from *Him* to *Us*. Now, this last part, (though it contains a thousand yeeres,) he cuts off from the score of Fathers, and much more, puls them out of the Bench of *Judges*: the middle division he grumbles at, as not being worthy of, or, at most hardly admittable to that appellation: the first Age alone he freely acknowledges.

By what Criticism he does this, I am not able to understand: For, when I learn'd Latin, *Pater* signified the immediate progenitour of the Son; and St. *Paul* was of that opinion, telling his Converts, They had no Father but himself, because he had in person, begotten them by the Gospel: and though, by ampliation, this word has included also the Parents of our Fathers, and upwards even to *Adam*; yet how it comes so to signifie the most remote, as to exclude the neerest, is beyond my skil in Grammar. Pray, let this good Definitor reflect upon himself: if the first remembred of his race had died without Issue, how could he have been

been one of his Forefathers? no more, had there been no Preachers after the firſt three hundred yeers till our time, ſhould we have accounted thoſe Primitive Ones our Fathers. That they are Fathers, then, is becauſe they begot Preachers, who continued the propagation of the ſame doctrine to our daies: which we profeſs they did among us; and that therfore we are their Spiritual Off-ſpring, they our Fathers.

But *Daillè* and his Conſorts fault is not, that they contract the compaſs of the Fathers; but that they acknowledge any. For they are all Muſhroms, ſprung up as new as the morning, not ſo much as one from another, if they be true to their tenets: every one of them is bound to ſay to *Calvin*, as wel as to the Saints, I believe not for thy word, but I have heard it from the Apoſtles own mouths in the Scripture.

Though, indeed, I have no reaſon to quarrel much with Him upon this point: for, if he acknowledges the word *Fathers*, he denies the *Thing* or Vertue of it in them; ſince, to be a Father, is to propagate Chriſts doctrine to poſterity: which quality he muſt of neceſſity deny them, whilſt he thinks their doctrine not to be that of Chriſt; and that it ought, by every private man, be brought to the teſt of the *Bible*, and ſo far accepted or

refus'd

refus'd, as, to the grave judgement of ſome judicious Blue-apron, ſeems agreeable to the ſenſe of Scripture.

This, then, is the pious deſign of this Authour, To inſinuate a belief, that, ſince the *Apoſtles* daies, there has not been a ſufficient *living Witneſſe* of what they taught the world, or what *Chriſt* taught them. In which there are two notorious propoſitions infolded, worthy to be look'd into. Firſt, that theſe good Chriſtians, at one leap free themſelves from all the bands of *Community* and *Society* of mankind, and from all ſubjection to the Kingdom of Chriſt, which they flatly deny. For, Nature teaches us, there can be no Government without Judges; I mean, *living* Definitors and Deciders of occaſional debates: therefore, if Chriſt has left no Judges upon Earth, he has no kingdom here: ſuch Judges I ſpeak of, as ſhould adminiſter His Law; for he came not to plant temporal Kings, but a ſpiritual Regiment, wherin, if he has had no Judges ſince the Apoſtles deceaſe, his Kingdom expir'd with them.

Now then, the whol drift of this Writer is, to eſtabliſh an abſolute *Anarchy*; where every one indifferently ſhall be Maſter without control, in that great and principal Myſtery of training up ſouls to eternal happineſs:

neſs: which by how much more dark and difficult the ſpiritual conduct to future bliſs is, then temporal government to preſent wealth and ſecurity, ſo much more unreaſonable and unnatural muſt the poſition be, that diſſolvs all obèdience to Eccleſiaſtical Superiours, and aboliſhes all *Order* in the Church: An aſſertion juſtly to be abhor'd by any, who has the leaſt ſpark of love to that only great Good, the ſalvation of his Soul.

The other Propoſition is, that ſince the Apoſtles time, there has been no publik either true doctrine or good life, in that part of the World which we call *Chriſtian.* I do not mean, there may not have appeared ſome vertuous actions in private perſons, (though perhaps the conſequence might be driven ſo far;) but that, all viſible Companies have had both their *Doctrine* ſpotted with foul *tenets*, and their conſequent *practiſes* polluted with Superſtition and Idolatry: For, as this is one of the main grounds for their rejecting the Fathers; ſo, the reaſon *à priori* (which they alledge) being once admitted, evinces the truth of the Concluſion *I* charge upon them: it being evident, that if becauſe *man is fallible*, the *Fathers* are inſufficient to propagate truth to their poſterity; and, out of the poſition of inſufficiency

ency, muſt of neceſſity follow the conſequence of defect; certainly then, the following generations had not ſufficient inſtruction, either for belief or actions. And indeed, the *Reformers* themſelvs acknowledg as much; ſince they eſteem the Fathers errours ſo groſs, that it was fit to leave the communion of that Church, wherin they are defended, rather then accept of ſuch abominations. Now if this be not to deny all good life, and the main and univerſal fruit of Chriſts paſſion, even in thoſe preferr'd Ages, I have loſt my little wits.

This, therfore, I ſay, is the aym and project of his Book; to prove, That ſince Chriſts time, there has been no ſufficient *living* teſtimony of the *Truth* of *Religion*, no command or *government* of *Chriſtians*, as *Chriſtians*; and laſtly, no *holineſs* or good life, nor any fitting direction among mankind brought in and ſtated by our kind Saviour and wiſeſt Law-giver *Jeſus Chriſt*. Now, how great an encouragement and advance this may prove, either towards vertue or ſtudy of Religion, I underſtand not. This I know, if any would purpoſely ſeek to draw off our hearts from all hope of heaven and practice of vertue, I cannot imagin a more efficacious argument, then, Firſt, to tell how much pains our Saviour had

had taken to plant a right *Faith* and Chriſtian *life*, in ſo many years of example and Preaching, cloſing all with ſuch ſtrange unparalleld ſuffrings: Nay, that he had ſent the *Holy Ghoſt*, in ſo manifeſt and glorious a manner from heaven, upon his *Diſciples*, to fire their hearts with *zeal* and impower their hands to *Miracles*, giving them Commiſſion to publiſh his *new Law* over all the World, and ſolemnly engaging to aſſiſt them for ever: And yet afterwards bring in proofs, how, notwithſtanding all this, ſoon as theſe Apoſtles were dead, Idolatry and corruption, both of doctrin and manners, began preſently to appear, in the greateſt and beſt Members of the Church, even the immediate Diſciples of the Apoſtles; and in ſhort time, ſo over-run the whole World, that the means of Salvation was generally loſt, and the way to heaven obſtructed with an univerſal deluge of vice and ſuperſtition. Theſe proofs are the work of our excellent *Author*: whence I think it no boldneſs to conclude, this Treatiſe, of *the right uſe of the Fathers*, is the perfecteſt piece that ever was written, for the utter extermination of *Chriſtian doctrin*, and abſolute ruin of all *vertue*. For, when I turn o're the Book, I cannot but acknowledg it full of as good Topicks, caſt into as neat a ſtile, and qualify'd with as

ſeeming

ſeeming a fit temper conveniently to betray unwary ſouls, as any modern I ever read: but I fear not, theſe few animadverſions I have haſtily collected, ſufficiently demonſtrate to the ſight of any that will but open their eys, how dangerous and damnable a a poyſon lies hidden under that guilded hypocritical cover.

THE SECOND SURVEY.

Of the two firſt Chapters of his firſt Book; wherin he urges that the Fathers of the three firſt ages were few, and their writings wholly unconcerning our Controverſies.

THe intention of the Work being ſo pious, ſo conformable to nature and the ways of the Author of nature; you cannot chuſe but expect the proofs very ſound and convincing: And, if you will believe either my *Lord of Briſtow's* judgment or my opinion, we ſhall eaſily agree in his *Elogium*, both of them and their Author, that *little material or weighty, can be ſaid on this ſubject, which*

which his rare and piercing observation has not anticipated.

To understand his perswasions the better, I entreat you, reflect upon two ways, or rather two parts of one way, ordinarily chosen by such jugling Orators, as we before made mention of; who use to employ their wits in contradicting open verities.

The first is, to talk much of the common notion, when the question is of a particular. As if one would undertake to dissuade a man from travelling to *Rome*, because 'tis a long journey; he will plead the inconveniences which accompany long journeys, and immediatly talk of Wildernesses, wild Beasts, great Robberies, dangerous Rivers, unpassable Mountains, want of Company, and disfurnishment of all accommodations by the way,& a thousand such frightful narrations which occur in the misfortunes of Shipwrack'd men, and the desperate voyages of Romance-Lovers: But never descend to consider, whether all these be found in the way to *Rome*, or what remedies are provided to correct such Symptomes; knowing too wel, that equivocation is easily couch'd and ambushed in common propositions, but soon detected, if a descent be made to particulars.

The other Fallacy is, To assign real inconve-

conveniences, but not tell you how far they annoy the Subject, alledging many ſad things, but concealing how great they are. As a man may have the *Gout* or *Stone* in ſo ſlight a meaſure, that they ſhall never trouble him: yet a third perſon, who hears the melancholy relation, may conceit and pitty his caſe as moſt deplorable; becauſe the Reporter, not expreſſing the violence of theſe diſeaſes; leavs an impreſſion in our minds of ſuch a degree of pain and affliction, as we ordinarily commiſerate in thoſe that ſuffer the extreameſt fury of ſuch vexatious tormentors.

Theſe two Fallacies run, in a manner, through his whole Book; which he divides into two parts, very methodically. In the former, he pretends to ſhew 'tis an exceſſive hard, if not impoſſible, task to know the *meaning* of the *Fathers:* In the later, that, ſuppoſing their *ſenſe* were known, it imported little to the diſpatch of controverſies; they being not *infallible*, nor without all danger of errour: grounding himſelf on this maxim, that *the underſtanding neither can, nor indeed ought to believe any thing in point of Religion, but what it knows to be certainly true.*

Which, had it come out of a *Roman Catholicks* mouth, would have ſounded glorioufly,

ouſly, and worthy the dignity of that Faith which God and *Ieſus Chriſt*, being the Author of, have compleatly furniſht with clear and ſolid principles. He perhaps would have offered you choice, either of *Faith* or *Knowledg*; produced in order to *this*, as perfect demonſtrations as *Ariſtotle* is ador'd for; and towards *that*, engaged you in the moſt evident directors of humane life, and cleerly evidenc'd, by the principles of common ſenſe, that, if you refuſe the Authority of the *Roman Church*, you renounce all the certainties on which you build every ſerious action of your life; & in a word conſtrain'd you to deny or affirm ſomwhat that your ſelf, in another caſe, will confeſs a meer madneſs to affirm or deny.

But, in *Monſieur Daille's* mouth, who, in his next words, will caſt you upon the vanity of a broken breath, which has been a boulting and ſearſing theſe hundred years, without any profit in the certainty of its meaning; I cannot pierce farther, then that this glorious principle is aſſum'd, as the readieſt means to betray his Auditor into a deſpair of Chriſtianity, and then leave him in the gulf of Atheiſm.

However, let's ſee the nature of his proofs, which for the firſt point, he has ſcrewd up to eleven. The three firſt are, that the *Fa-*

thers

thers works, especially in the three first *Centuries*, were very few, and of matters far different from the present controversies; and besides, many false writings father'd upon those *Saints* by unworthy persons; (of which last imputation my third *Survey* gives you a more exact particular.) Nor can I deny any of this, but I find two exceptions, which I believe would shrewdly trouble the Minister to answer: One, that *those* of the pretended *Reformation*, who have so much modesty in them, as not to renounce utterly the *authority* of the *whole Church of Jesus Christ* at one blow, strive to shelter their nakedness in these three *Centuries*: wherof these three arguments make me plainly see the reason, Because by the *paucity of Books*, the *difference of Subject*, and *pretence of Forgery*, they hope nothing can be made evident for those Ages: and so, the purity for which they cry up those days as only worth our conformity, is in that sense the Poet says, *puræ sunt plateæ*, that is, ther's no body in the streets.

My other unsatisfaction is, He does not shew that even in these ages, and those very works which he acknowledges for the Authors home-born Children, and to have descended incorrupted to our daies, there is not *sufficient* to convince all Hereticks.

For,

For, though every particular point peradventure cannot, in ſo few works and written ſo accidentally to our purpoſe, be clearly demonſtrated; yet, the generality of the *Rule* we are to follow in Chriſtian doctrin is ſo manifeſtly ſet down, in thoſe very *Fathers* he admits, that, were their writings made our judges, no man could poſſibly be an Heretick: ſince, as the material points the Fathers wrote againſt were different from ours; ſo the *formal* ones, as the *deſerting the Catholick communion*, *the renouncing the teſtimony of Apoſtolical Seas*, and *the hiding themſelves under the leaves of Scripture*, were common to all the ancient as well as modern Hereticks. But however, if he cannot maintain, that there is not enough left to convince the truth; his proof is deficient, and wholly uſeleſs to the end he brings it.

One obſervation more I cannot chuſe but note: He quarrels with ſome Catholick Doctors, who prefer the ſecond *Tricentury* before the firſt, as to the right underſtanding the ſenſe of the Fathers: Which he ſays he takes for a confeſſion of the want of teſtimonies in the former Ages, and doubts not but in equal clearneſs, they would prefer the firſt *Tricentury*, for point of purity before the latter. But either his own opinion or miſ-underſtanding our *Tenets* de-

ceiv'd him: For, we do not imagin the former ages *more pure* then the later, ſince we admit no errours in either, but make no queſtion that the univerſality of Fathers in any two ages held the ſame doctrin; and ſo, the Faith of the ſecond *Tricentury* being known, we account *that* of the former undoubted; eſpecially we all believing the latter Fathers receiv'd their doctrin from the former, not by reading their Books, which belong'd to few, but by being inſtructed from their mouths who had receiv'd it from them. But he thinks his Reformers very probably maintain that Chriſtian Religion has long been in a dangerous conſumption, declining ſtill by little and little, and loſing in every Age ſome certain degree of its Primitive vigour and native complexion; to which purpoſe he cites the words of *Hegeſippus* out of *Euſebius*, *That this infirmity began as ſoon as the Apoſtles were dead.*

This poſition ſounds to me, as if the opinions they cry out againſt for abominations enter'd ſo early into the Church; and have continued in it ſo long, that they can now reckon fifteen *Centuries*: nor can I deſire either a more ingenuous confeſſion or ſtronger proof of the truth of thoſe doctrines, which the nature of Chriſtianity has preſery'd with ſuch exact care, and conſtant tenderneſs that

in

in ſo many ages, not one of them has been forgotten, not one of them ever oppos'd, by thoſe who, in all generations, have ſtil been accounted the ſound party of Chriſtians. Beſides, I ſhould expect, that ſo foul a blemiſh, as theſe bold accuſers lay upon the Church, viz. that ſhe has been an Idolatrous and abominable Harlot, ever ſince the death of the Apoſtles, ought not to be grounded on bare probable conjectures, but evidently convinced; under penalty that, otherwiſe, the Calumniators ſhould ſuffer, at leaſt, as heavy a Cenſure, as they attempt to paſs againſt the Church.

But, becauſe, for the maintenance of this odious ſlander, he chiefly rely's on *Hegeſippus's* teſtimony, let the witneſs be fairly examin'd; and that according to the Authors own citation, which runs to this effect, *After the Apoſtles death, the Maſters of Seduction began publickly and profeſſedly, to vent their falſly named Science, againſt the preaching of the truth*: which, in plain Engliſh ſignifies no more, then that Hereticks roſe up againſt the Church: and is ſo far from arguing the Churches corruption, that it ſtrongly concludes her purity, ſince the doctrin, which falſhood contradicts, muſt neceſſarily be it ſelf true. Thus clearly it follows from theſe words, that the wrong imputed cor-

ruption was *out* of the Church, and ſoundneſſe of Faith *in* her Communion.

But, if we look into the Text exactly, the meaning of that paſſage is this, *After the Apoſtles death, the conſiſtence of Hereſie took its beginning*; that is, *Hereticks* grew into a body, daring to ſhew their heads, where, before they lurk'd for fear of the *Apoſtles*: which expreſſion manifeſtly proves, They began to make congregations, diſtinct from the true Church. And, this being evident, we cannot be troubled with thoſe words going before in *Higeſippus*, which ſay, *till then the Church was a virgin and uncorrupted*; for it is a phraſe natural enough, to call the body corrupted, whoſe putrify'd parts are cut off or rotted away, as thoſe degenerate members were from the Church of God: And ſo this very *Daillé* could cite (upon another occaſion) theſe ſelf-ſame Innovators under the direct notion of *Hereticks*, when he thought it might better ſerve his turn.

THE

THE THIRD SURVEY.

Of his 3d. and 4th. Chapters, wherin he objects forgery and corruption of the Fathers works.

AS to the third point, of *Forgery*, our *Monſieur* dilates himſelf exceedingly; but, how much to the purpoſe, ſome few notes wil diſcover. Firſt, he objects many counterfeit Books, that are not now extant, nor have been theſe many Ages: and think you not there muſt neceſſarily ariſe a ſtrange obſcurity in our Controverſies, from ſuch forgeries? Then, he complains, that Tranſcribers have put wrong names to books, either for the better ſelling them, or out of ignorance; and, in ſome of them, the queſtion is about Authors almoſt of the ſame age: all which is likewiſe little to the point; for, where the *Ages opinion*, and not the particular credit of the Author's learning is requir'd; the authority of one underſtanding writer ought generally to weigh as much as anothers: and this is the caſe in controverſies; where the ſenſe of the Church, not

not that of private *Doctors*, is the ſubject of our inquiry.

Neither muſt I forget his defamation of the ancient Chriſtians, as counterfeiters of the *Sybils* Propheſies, out of the calumny of the wicked *Celſey*, which nevertheleſſe we ſee *Lactantius* ſtands upon to the Heathens faces. He omits not, for a notorious piece of forgery, that the Canons of the Council of *Sardica* are cited as of the Council of *Nice*: wherin nothing is more certain, then that the Canons were true, though not admitted by the *Greeks*, who, being cal'd, would not come to the *Council*. So the queſtion ſtands meerly upon this, whether they ought to be cal'd the Canons of *Nice*, being made by a Council gather'd afterwards to confirm the former? which the *Latines* defend, and the *Greeks* diſlike. Doubtleſs a main forgery, to be urg'd by this temperate man, whoſe charity, no queſtion, would have winkt at ſmall faults.

Yet becauſe no ordinary ſatisfaction will content him, though thoſe *Popes* were all both commended by the Ages in which they liv'd, and reputed Saints by the enſuing *Church*, and One of them that great *Saint Leo*, whoſe Oracles were ſo highly eſteem'd in the Council of *Chalcedon*: I will briefly ſet down the caſe. The *Arian* Emperour

Con-

Conſtantius (though yet, for fear not declar'd ſuch) ſummon'd a *Generall Council* of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, to a Town cal'd *Sardica*. There aſſembled betwixt 3 and 4 hundred Biſhops. The *Arians*, ſeeing themſelvs like to come to the worſt, by the number of the Orthodox party, upon ſought pretences, went to another place, cald *Philippopolis*; where, making an aſſembly of their own, they term'd it, from the Emperours Summons, *the Council of Sardica*: And, partly by their diligence and ſending circular Letters thorow Chriſtendom, partly by joyning with a great faction of *Donatiſts*, but chiefly (as it may be juſtly believ'd) by the power of the *Emperours Officers*, made the name of the *Council of Sardica* paſſe for the denomination of their Conventicle, both in the Eaſt, and thorow ſuch remote parts as had not ſpecial intelligence of what paſs'd in *Sardica*. Hence, any *Canons* pretended to be order'd at *Sardica*, were blaſted before known: wherupon it fel out, that the ſmall party which knew the truth, was forc'd, in their collections of *Canons*, to place theſe next to the Council of *Nice* (as their order requir'd) without a name, and as an *Appendix* of the Council. In this poſture theſe *Popes* found them about an hundred yeers after: and, whether it was that they

they were not ſufficiently acquainted with the Accident, or whether they thought the action legitimate, and the ground of it ſufficient, they urg'd them as Canons of *Nice*; and, after the matter was examin'd, bore the Cauſe, in force of them, and continu'd on to poſterity ſtill the ſame denomination.

This is that ſolemn Forgery he decries with ſo loud a clamor; and concluds his vehemency with ſo notorious a falſhood, that every three-penny Controvertiſt can ſpit in his face. For he ſays, that even now a great part of Chriſtendom holds, and 'tis generally urg'd by all, that *the Popes Authority in Appeals* was firſt given him by the Council of *Nice*: wheras, the moſt ordinary opinion is, that 'tis *jure divino*; and thoſe that look on *jus poſitivum*, are ſo cunning, as to diſtinguiſh the Council of *Nice* from that of *Sardica*; and in that of *Nice*, ſeek only a *Teſtimony* of what was in uſe before the Council, not a *Guift* of this Authority.

His next accuſation concerns certain *writings* that both the Catholiks and pretenders to Reformation agree to be Counterfeit: which, how little it imports our Controverſie, ſince neither party grounds any doctrin upon them, needs not be expreſs'd.

Another

Another ſort he counts for Forgery, when Catholiks, among themſelvs, queſtion certain pieces of ancient Authors; in which caſe, he ſtill joyns himſelf to that part of Catholiks that refuſes to admit ſuch paſſages for legitimate, and then immediately charges all the reſt who receive them, with downright forgery: which is the ſame as to call all men Knaves, that are not of his ſide; as if no real and juſt doubt could be made of Authors by ſober and vertuous perſons, but all muſt be imputed to malice; ſo that, this exception is plainly a peeviſh and ſhallow cavil: and beſides, no waies available to his purpoſe; ſince, that which is in real doubt among Catholiks, can be no argument againſt Heretiks.

He that has patience enough to take notice of theſe qualities in his Chapter of *Forgery*, and ſee that, beſides this, he has nothing in it but aiery diſcourſes, in common, how *writings* may be corrupted, cannot chuſe but ſay

--Movet Cornicula riſum,
Furtivis nudata coloribus.

And yet ſuppoſe all he endeavours were true, in *abſtracto*, there remains ſtil the application; wherein if he miſcarry, inſtead of pulling down the *Fathers*, he lays himſelf in the duſt: for, after never ſo many

Books

Books never ſo much diſabled, if we can finde a Library full of unſuſpected and univerſally acknowledg'd Authors, we ſufficiently diſcover the impertinency and deceitfulneſs of this manner of proceeding.

Therfore, to prevent this inconvenience, our quaint Diſcourſer raiſes two ſuſpicions againſt the confeſt works of *Fathers*: One of *Corruption*, the other of *Obſcurity*. The former he begins from the eſcapes of *Tranſcribers*; which, as we cannot deny to have ſome force, if ſpoken *in common*, ſo, apply'd *to particulars*, we ſhall find little important to our purpoſe: For, if the queſtion were of ſome *two or three* Sentences ſpoken *by the by*, ſuch perhaps might be ſuſpected, though not juſtly, without better ground then a bare ſurmiſe; becauſe, where the error of the Tranſcriber has its amplitude to happen in one of ten thouſand lines, to ſay it lights juſt *here*, is a very weak conjecture, unleſs there be more particular cauſes of jealouſie alledg'd, (which may apply it to that place,) then follow from this common courſ: But, when there are formall and ſet diſcourſes, or frequent and expreſs paſſages, to the ſame effect and purpoſe; then this ſuſpition has no weight at all: and ſuch is the caſe betwixt Catholiks, and the Pretenders to Reformation.

At

At the next turn, he would perſwade us, that St. *Hierome*, *Ruffinus*, and others, who abridg'd certain Greek works in their tranſlation, did thereby falſify the Authors; afterward, that the collections of Canons made either by Greeks or Latins are corruptions, becauſe they omitted ſuch as they diſlik'd or had no uſe of: not underſtanding or diſſembling his knowledge, that ſuch Books are not intended for *Hiſtories*, to tell us what paſs'd, but *Rules* for government, and ſo to be fitted to the particular occaſion; taking what conduces to the writers purpoſe, and leaving out ſuch paſſages as are (though in themſelvs good) yet impertinent to his deſigns. In the ſame rank are *Liturgies*; which being the *publik prayers*, are ſubject to be enlarg'd, contracted, or changed, according to the devotion of the people and prudence of the Paſtors, as we ſee daily practiſed: and ſo are better teſtimonies for univerſality, in their diſtricts, then of antiquity. Theſe, therfore, neither are corruptions, nor make the ſenſe of the *Fathers* more difficult: for we can uſe but ſo much as we find in them, and ſo far, they are as authentical as any other; whilſt what is not there cannot be preſsd out of them.

After theſe, he produces ſome debates between

tween the Latines and Greeks, about falsifying certain passages; whose quarrels it concerns not me to take up: only I must note, the brotherly correction he gives the Fathers in these words, *thus did they bandy stifly one against the other; each of them, as it may be easily perceiv'd, having much more appearance of reason and truth in their accusation of their Adversary, then in excusing or defending themselvs*; which is no less then a plain condemnation of all, how ever disputable the case be in it self. Now, how many of such passages mutually objected, justly deserv'd that calumniation, and were not, by the fervour of disputation only term'd so (being in themselvs but mistakes, and wrong informations) is too long a business for the brevity I propose to my self.

Yet this also I may observe, not without ground, from *Daillè* himself, that the true controversie concerning such abuses has been indeed between *Catholiks* and *Heretiks*, but not *Latins* and *Greeks* in common; for the Catholik Greeks stil accus'd their Hereticks of great corruption. And this is reasonable, because Catholiks having alwaies stood for, and rely'd on Antiquity, alwaies upbraided and condemn'd *Hereticks*, as guilty of novelty; it necessarily follows, they were without question fully perswaded their

opinion

opinion was the same with the Fathers, and had a real and true evidence of it: wheras Heretiks, not esteeming Antiquity for it self, but only for fear of scandalizing the generality of Christians, who are stil brought up in a high reverence of it, were bound to seek those waies that might satisfy as wel as deceive the people, without any inward and hearty respect to the Fathers themselvs: a charge this very Author justifies not to be uncharitably apply'd to such Innovators; whilst his own chief endeavours strive to make us think the *Fathers* are like *Epicurus*'s Gods, Fine things in themselvs, but hung so high, their sound cannot reach us mortals here below upon Earth. Neither indeed is the case of Ambition much unlike that of Heresie: for, those who encroach upon publik practices of former Ages, are forc'd to use their utmost skil in falsifying all they can, to obscure the evidence of what passed in the daies of their Ancestors.

One other particular wil challenge me, if I go on without taking at least some little notice of it: and 'tis the Grecians objection about adding this word *Filioque* to the Creed of *Nicæa:* which having insisted on more largly in another place, I shall pacify with this short answer; Since, 'tis confest by

by both parties, that the main Creed was made in that Council, and received this *addition*, from another, freely and openly avow'd for *such* by the Roman Church: the queſtion could not be of *corruption*, (which ſeems to imply a ſecret deſign of impoſing on the world) but of the *lawfulneſs* of the Addition.

Now, let us paſs to his accuſation of later times; where, he complains there is far more falſ play. His firſt inſtance is, againſt certain varieties in the ancient Fathers; that ſome Manuſcrips or Impreſſions agree not with others: as if every one that ſets out a Book muſt have ſeen all Manuſcripts, or elſe he corrupts the Ancient Copy. But, that which angers him is, the words omitted or added are againſt his *tenets*; whence he gathers it was no caſual eſcape, but a deliberate plot of voluntary corruption: but he that wil loſe ſo much time as to take notice how weak and inconſiderable the paſſages are, even in his own citations, wil eaſily ſee this chief proof conſiſts meerly in a bold aſſertion.

I ſhall therfore rely on my Readers ingenuity, and only cite two or three examples for a pattern of the reſt: As, that the word *Petra* is changed into *Petrus*, in that famous ſentence of St. *Cyprian*, *Cathedra una ſuper petrum*

Petrum Domini voce fundata; That, in St. *Ambroſe*, ſome books are ſeparated, which in other Copies are joyn'd together; that, in St. *Peters* life, is omitted a certain Exhortation, adviſing his Succeſſors to abſtain from ſecular cares: Pretences ſo ſlight in themſelves, ſo impertinent to the main cauſe; that, none but a petty *Polititian* would have ſtoopt to ſuch trivial corruptions, nor any but a wrangling *Sophiſter* pretended ſuch childiſh exceptions.

But, not content with what has been done, he preſſes us with what would have been done, if I know not whoſe counſail had been follow'd: which is nothing but the wild Chimera's of a ſick brain. Next he is offended that Heretical books have been forbidden and aboliſh'd: as if any could think it reaſonable, ſedicious Pamphlets againſt Kings and States ſhould paſſe unreprehended in their dominions; exhortations to Idolatry be permitted among the Jews; or ſuch blaſphemies as pretend to prove *Chriſt* an Impoſtor ſhould be tolerated among Chriſtians. I wonder calumnies ſo ſhallow, ſo impudent, and of ſo deſperate a conſequence can finde patience enough in any perſon of underſtanding to read them; & yet I ſee great wits ſtrangly applaud them.

The actions, therfore, cal'd by him corrup-

ruptions, consisting only in such, to the very end of his *fourth Chapter*, you wil easily perceive that this so wel bodied Chapter also (if the impertinencies with which he lards it were substracted) would prove as lean and starv'd as *Pharao's* Oxen. Besides, if we seek to direct his arrow towards the intended scope, this last concerns not the ancient Fathers; since now, Expurgations are only for Moderns, as anciently they were only against Hereticks. The other objections reach no way to disable this safe and principal answer, That, notwithstanding all his cavils, there may still remain a sufficient number of the *Fathers* writings, pure and incorrupted, to convince the doctrin of the *Catholik Church*.

THE FOURTH SURVEY.

Of the fifth Chapter; wherin he objects the Fathers Eloquence; and that, on set purpose, they spake obscurely.

I Shall pass now to the next Flourish, rather then Argument: where, this bold unwary man (offering to prove the *Fathers* are

are hard to be underſtood) aſſigns thoſe very reaſons, that make all other Authors more eaſily underſtandable. For firſt, what Languages more copious, more regular, and wherein Schollers are more vers'd, then *Latin* and *Greek*, which are the Fathers Idiomes? Yes, ſays he, but few arrive to that perfection in them, as is truly requiſite for the exact managing of Controverſies. Be it ſo: But then, let no others meddle with this part of Controverſies, like Maſters, but they; let ſuch on both ſides try the quarrel, whilſt others for this part rely on them.

But again he renews his firſt complaint: how ſmal a number are they that are fitly qualify'd to enter the liſts in ſo difficult a combate? I do not fear, if this Author were ask'd of *France*, *Holland*, and *Germany*, he would readily undertake to find twenty of his own ſide compleatly furniſht for ſuch a skirmiſh; and, ſince our Party is both more extended, enjoys better commodity for ſtudying, and cleerly, by its numerous works, ſhews it ſelf far more laborious, He may well allow us at leaſt as many as he promiſes to produce of his own: If then, betwixt both, may be found at the ſame time, forty ſufficiently train'd for the encounter, what need we ask any more? there will not

want enough beſides, capable to profit themſelvs out of their Labours.

He proceeds to help himſelf upon St. *Hieroms* ſpeech againſt *nimium diſerti*, and ſome faults of weak interpreters: And preſumes, the places he brings clear: though my ſight is not quick enough to perceive it of any, but one of St. *Auſtin cont. Adimant.* which he clears himſelf, by adding to the Fathers Text *cùm ſignum daret corporis ſui*, the word *only* in his interpretation. Then he urges, Men bring obſcure places to interpret Scripture: but the unhappineſs is, his inſtances are of his own party.

He preſſes, that the *Fathers*, before the riſing of Hereſies, ſpake ambiguouſly and doubtfully, and that which ſeem'd to be againſt their own certain ſenſe and meaning; as he exemplify's out of St. *Athanaſius* and St. *Baſil*, concerning ſome Fathers before the *Arian* Hereſy. But this Wel-meaner forgets that (at leaſt in his examples) he brings the ſalve with the ſtroak: for, confeſſing 'twas ſhew'd to be againſt the writers meaning, he implicitly tels us, either there were other precedent or ſubſequent expreſſions in the ſame place, which made the doubtful words plain; or, at leaſt ſo evident paſſages of the ſame Author, in other places, that there could be no doubt of his meaning, in

the

the ambiguous ones. And, truly if we obſerve this gentle *Sophiſters* diſcourſ, we ſhal eaſily ſee, he imagines, that proofs from the *Fathers* ought to be brought by the popping out of half a Sentence, and never regard either what goes before or follows after; as, by the inſtances we have already examin'd, you may perceive is the reform'd faſhion of citing *Scriptures*: Wheras, the Books of *Fathers* being large and ample, allow greater Carreers to thoſe who run matches in them.

He adds farther, that the *Fathers* deliver'd ſome things on ſet purpoſe, obſcurely. If his meaning be, they expreſt their thoughts in certain occaſions, ſhortly or not fully; what danger is there in that? We know wel all arguments drawn from them muſt be made out of what *they have*, not what *they might have* written: and ſo, the erudition he ſpends, in proving this, had been better employ'd to ſhew the height of thoſe Myſteries the *Fathers* ſaw juſt cauſe to conceal, then in cavilling at their compendious expreſſions, which ſuted beſt with their circumſtances. And certainly 'tis moſt agreeable to reaſon, that the mind of ſuch as wrote before the Controverſy began, ſhould be judged by thoſe Fathers, who (for the eaſier defence of truth and fuller confutation

of the Innovators) were forc'd to break the Seal of ſecrecy: and, who (being their immediate Diſciples) without doubt muſt neceſſarily beſt know their minds, and conſequently were moſt able to repeat the leſſons they had ſo lately learnt of their Maſters.

He afterwards reckons up certain Grammar weakneſſes of ſome *Fathers*, and the excellencies of others, and, out of both, draws venom to his comb: So that, whether a Father write down right natural conſtruction, or (by abilities of explicating himſelf) poliſh his ſtile, all breeds darkneſs to this great Illuminator (or Calumniator rather) of the Fathers: Nay, the very vices they cry out againſt in evil Preachers, muſt be the faults of the Princes of antiquity, by this Interpreters benevolence. But he knocks all on the head, by the example of St. *Hierom*; who, having related what had paſſed in him during his ſleep, in another place defends it was but a dream: And can you believe, the Objector was awake, when he fumbled out this piece of impertinency? Yet he urges it for a convincing evidence: and, bearing a ſpecial good wil to St. *Hierom*, he very kindly perſwades himſelf, that the Stories of *Malchus*, St. *Paul* the *Eremit*, and St. *Hillarion*, were Romances; the firſt, becauſe

cauſe his maligners calumniated it; the other two, (though never queſtion'd) becauſe he ſhew'd wit in them.

It ſeems too, he would beget in his Reader this dutiful conceit of the Fathers, that they were wont to deliver Romances for Articles of Faith; concluding with this deſperate and ungracious demand, *Who ſhall aſſure us, that they have not made uſe of theſe ſame Arts, in their diſcourſes concerning the Euchariſt?* and afterwards renews again the like impudent *quære*, diſcovering too openly the prophaneſs of his heart; as if he ſuſpected the *Fathers* might, perhaps, have cozen'd the people, with ſome falſ glaſſes, to magnifie *the power of Prelates.*

Next, he objects, the *Fathers* often affirm or deny abſolutely, what they mean only comparatively: and, if you wil not believe him, he produces examples out of St. *Hicrom*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Amphilochius* and *Aſterius*. But, St. *Hierom* is plainly, in the very words comparative: The reſt are both explicated to the ſame ſenſe, by the bordering Ages, who might eaſily know the practice of their lives in that controverſie, and in his very citation, have nothing capable of being urg'd againſt that explication; beſides, the phraſe it ſelf is favourable. What great difficulty is there to pick out the Engliſh of this

this ſentence, *Præmia pudicitiæ nuptiæ poſſidere non poſſunt*,&c. with the reſt, too trivial to be repeated?

He makes a ſecond review of the Fathers ſpeeches, concerning ſome Hereſy not yet debated, upon another deſign; to ſhew, that while they ſpeak againſt one Hereſie, they ſeem to fall into the contrary. But there is no new difficulty brought, unleſſe it be of thoſe terms ἀγωνιστικῶς and κατ' οἰκονομίαν, both which this Author abuſes by a wrong interpretation: the firſt he renders, *let fall in heat of diſputation*, inſtead of giving it the true ſenſe, which Engliſhes it thus, *ſuppoſed for diſputation ſake* (for ſo 'tis contradiſtinguiſh'd to δογματικῶς, to which St. *Baſil* oppoſes it:) the later he explicates done or ſaid *by diſpenſation*, whereas the proper ſignification is, *by diſcretion*; St. *Athanaſius*'s meaning being that he deliverd what was fitteſt in that occaſion, and for the perſon to whom, or in whoſe name he ſpake; for his words give us ſome hints inclining to either of thoſe ſenſes, that He intended only to perſonate an objection againſt himſelf, or elſe to draw ſome anſwer out of another, without engaging to declare his own judgment.

But 'tis worthy our pains to look into the ſweet interpretation he makes, and compare

pare it with the Greek which himſelf puts in the margin: he reads therfore thus, οὐ δεῖ τὰ κατ' οἰκονομίαν γραφόμενα καὶ γινόμενα ταῦτα κακοτρόπως δέχεσθαι καὶ εἰς ἰδίαν ἔλκειν ἕκαστον βούλησιν; that is, men ought not maliciouſly to take (or underſtand) and draw it to be his proper meaning, what one writes or does (as now its cal'd) *ad hominem*; for, κατ' οἰκονομίαν ſignifies according to the art and underſtanding to apply every thing to the particular circumſtances which offer themſelvs.

Laſtly, he tels us, *the uſe of words is chang'd ſince Antiquity*; but ſpecifies ſo ſimply, that without queſtion he hoped none but blind men would look into his book: as if the World now thought, that *Papa* ſignifies not a *ſpiritual Authority*, but a temporal *Garbo*; that *Confeſſio* ſignifies ſome outward ceremony; *Miſſa*, all the prayers now uſed, &c.

THE

THE FIFTH SURVEY.

Of the ſix Chapters following; wherin he objects wilful deceit to the Fathers.

HItherto our Oratour has opened thoſe Pleas, which, in a manner, of neceſſity follow'd that multitude of books the Fathers have written: and would, if we could believe him, perſwade us, Nothing is to be learn'd or underſtood out of Books; but every three words wil never fail to have ſome reaſon or other to make them ſo obſcure, that no light or ſatisfaction can be derived out of them.

Nor is all this enough, unleſs he gives them a touch of wilfulneſs: which he does upon three Heads. Firſt, from their writing Commentaries: where he notes, that many times they recite others opinions, without naming the parties; whence he would infer that, out of their Commentaries, nothing can be gather'd concerning their own judgment, in the point they handle.

I cannot deny, but ſuch kind of commenting

ting is ſometimes uſed: nor do I underſtand why it ſhould be reprehenſible, to propoſe to the Reader choice judgments of divers eminent learned Perſons, even of Hereticks ſomtimes, at leaſt in St. *Hieroms* days, when there were not ſo many Catholick writers, that all good explications might be found in them, though this honeſt man (who, otherwiſe is no enemy of liberty in Authors, and opinions) be, at preſent, for his intereſt, offended with it. But, we can come to no aſſurance of the Authors mind; what then? If we do not ſee directly what he inclines to, (though ordinarily ſome liking is ſhew'd more to one opinion then another;) yet we may know, he propoſes all interpretations for the reader to chuſe as he pleaſes; which imply's, that he ſaw no apparent inconvenience in any.

But, why is this manner of commenting made a calumny againſt all the reſt, being a particular kind and not much uſed? why brought for a prejudice againſt ſuch places where only one opinion is mentioned? why is St. *Hieroms* indefinite doctrin (which imports no more then that ſuch is the nature of ſome Commentaries) turn'd to an Univerſal, as if none ſhould do otherwiſe? Let him reflect upon *Beza's* or other of his own parties *gloſſes*; and ſee whether they do not

ſome-

ſomtimes explicate Scripture in a way equally obnoxious to the ſame exceptions. I deny not, but St. *Hierom*, (once ſurpriz'd by St. *Auſtin* in a weak explication upon a paſſage to the *Galathians*) excuſes himſelf by a confeſſion, that his memory being confuſed, he had in that place mingled his own opinion with other mens, without diſtinction: But, is it not an excellent piece of honeſty, out of one only particular defect of one Father, to draw an imputation, not upon him alone, but on the whole Senate of Antiquity? And yet, this thread runs quite thorow this captious Objectors Book; whoſe labour is, out of a *mole* in her face, to prove *Venus* was not fair.

Then he procesds to tax St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Hillary*, for borrowing doctrin of *Origen*, without citing the original: as if *Virgil* ſhould have ſtill named *Homer*, in all the places wherin he imitated him; or *Torquato Taſſo* told his reader, which *Stanza's* were his own invention, which tranſlated out of others.

His ſecond diſcontent is, that, when a paſſage of Holy Scripture is acknowledg'd by the *Fathers* to be capable of divers interpretations, yet they will preſume to uſe that ſenſe only which is convenient to their Auditory, omitting the others which, in thoſe circum-

circumſtances, make nothing to their purpoſe. The like diſtaſte he takes againſt them, when ſpeaking of a Myſtery that has two parts, they do not ſtill make mention of both: as, ſince *Chriſt* is *God* and *Man*, he will by this rule be offended, that a Father ſhould ſtile him *God*, without expreſſing in the ſame breath (though altogether unneceſſary to his Theam) that he was *Man*; as if we could not, ſomtimes upon occaſion, omit what we never intend to deny, but were ſtill bound to clog our diſcourſ with all the jealous cautions of a Lawyers Indentures: though indeed, he ſeems only troubled, when this happens concerning the bleſſed Sacrament: for then, it utterly diſappoints the force of thoſe Arguments he ſo highly eſteems.

Nor does his peeviſhneſs ſtay at theſe ſmaller *Peccadillo's*; but, to fill up the meaſure of his anger and farther enforce the accuſation he ſees himſelf engag'd in, his bold hand trembles not plainly to inſinuate, that the *Fathers* are in plain terms downright cheaters: contriving theſe omiſſions and ambiguity's, not by wiſdom and paſtoral prudence, but by cunning and hypocritical policy, with a malicious intention to delude their auditory. But theſe are little familiar ſtroaks, and kind expreſſions of his devotion

and

and respect to the *Fathers*, and the *Church* in whose communion they liv'd, and *Him* in whose precious death both They and It are founded.

His last crimination consists meerly in a repetition of what we discuss'd in the former *Chapter*, about the Fathers speeches *ad hominem*: yet, because he has a little changed his temper, we must observe what he says. First, being in a kind humour, he now imputes it only to excess of passion in the good old men, (as if the former had been out of malice) which made them speak they knew not what: wheras, the Ages after them, explicating such passages of their Predecessors, attribute it to deep wisdom and solid learning. Secondly, he shews us, out of St. *Hierom*, how all Authors use two ways of disputing; one direct and demonstrative or demonstration like, another Topical and tentative: but to what purpose, more then to form an aery apprehension, in the readers head, of some strange fallacy's and abuses ordinarily practised by those ancient Maintainers of Christianity, I understand not.

Yet, there remains about two lines of Latin; which his jugling art has obscur'd into a necessity of a short explication: and they are, that *interdum coguntur loqui non quod sentiunt*,

ſentiunt, ſed quod neceſſe eſt dicant contra ea quæ dicunt gentiles, which is as much as to ſay, they are forc'd ſomtimes not to contradict the Gentils propoſitions, that they may impugn them with better advantage. As when they ſeem to admit the truth of ſome *Oracles*, and apply their diſcourſe only to ſhew how ſuch extraordinary actions might be perform'd by the Devil: wheras perhaps, in their inward thoughts, they believ'd there were really none true, or, if any, that they were by Gods interpoſing his own power, to the Gentils confuſion, as he did in the apparition of *Samuel* to *Saul*, the *Witch* not being able to raiſe up ſouls by the ſingle force of her charms.

One new demand he urges, which ſeems and indeed is ſtrangly impertinent, *Whether it be a part of our Faith, to viſit the Holy Land:* as if thoſe words of St. *Hierom*, *adorâſſe ubi ſteterunt pedes Domini, pars fidei eſt*, ſignify'd truly, that to exerciſe adoration were an Article of Faith; then which, what can be ſpoken more ſenceleſly? wheras, the true meaning is plain and obvious, that tis a duty of Faith, or an action proceeding from Faith, or conformable to Faith; in which ſenſe, 'tis impoſſible to make any rational oppoſition againſt it.

I muſt not end without taking notice of a goodly

goodly piece of wit in mis-translating a passage of St. *Hierom*; wh entreats his reader to judg his meaning out of his whole discours, and *non in uno atque eodem libro criminari, me diversas sententias protulisse*, *not to accuse me, that I am of divers minds in the self-same Book*, which this good natur'd Interpreter explicates, *and not presently to accuse any Author of blockishness, for having deliver'd in one and the same Book two contrary opinions.* Nevertheless, himself has been, I will not say, so blockish, (for of that ther's too little cause to suspect him) but so slight and precipitate, as to put the very *Latin* words in the Margin, which is, as neer as can be, to contradict himself in the same breath.

In four ensuing Chapters he delivers us certain notes; which are in substance true, but bring not much obscurity or other disablement to the way of proving Religion by the writings of Fathers: and if they did, he and his new party remembring they wholly refuse the judgment of their Ancestors, need not trouble themselvs; but stand upon their exceptions, and leave the Catholiks to make their arguments sound and free from all legitimate repulse. For this is the law of Logick and reasoning, that the Actor should have liberty to frame his opposition (so it be according

to

to the rules of diſcourſe) as himſelf thinks beſt.

With this *caveat* I might juſtly omit theſe four Chapters; were it not that in his *eighth* he has a note of remark out of *Tertullian*, as requiring only that the Rule of Faith continue in its proper form and order, *Cæterùm, manente formâ ejus in ſuo ordine, quantum libet quæras & tractes, & omnem libidinem curioſitatis effundas:* to which he adds *Ruffinus* his Apology for *Origen*, as of the ſame opinion; and ſeems to take it for the practice of the preſent Church: And truly, I think with great reaſon.

For, as far as I underſtand Religion, Nothing makes an *Heretick*, but to recede from the known doctrin of the *preſent Church*, which ſhe practiſes as deriv'd from Chriſt, and wherof ſhe knows no other beginning: He that is not conſcious to himſelf of this, is no Heretick before God; and he that carries that guilt in his breaſt is αὐτοκατάκριτος whatever ſeeming reaſons he has for himſelf: and whoever teaches anypoint contrary to *this tradition*, not knowing ſuch contrariety, teaches indeed *Hereſie*, but is no *Heretick*: Let them agree in this chief Principle or *Rule of Faith*, and the reſt wil be only material errours in them. But, the cauſe they perverſly defend is inconſiſtent with

any

any ſuch ſubmiſſion: their own Conſciences and the evidence of the fact ſtigmatiſing their unlawful breach from the *univerſal doctrin of the Church*, from which they rebelliouſly ſeparated themſelvs.

As to the *Fathers* opinion, concerning the neceſſity of the *Euchariſt* for *Infants*, he muſt give us leave to think the *Council of Trent* was better informed then he; as is, in the precedent *Apologie* briefly diſcuſſed. That, St. *Ignatius* cals him a *murderer of Chriſt who faſts Saturdaies*, ſignifies no more then that he does an action which of its nature teſtifies our Saviour died twice, that is, upon *Saturday* as wel as *Friday*: though this man of truth in his firſt chapter vouchſafes not to admit any writings of St. *Ignatius* for true. The aſperſion laid upon St. *Hierom*, St. *Ambroſe*, annd *Tertullian*, as uſing Tragical expreſſions, without occaſion, is but a gap to Libertinage and vilifying of vertue; their ſayings being true, though this Reformer diſlike them.

His urging, that the modern points of Controverſie are not reſolv'd in former *Creeds* or *Councils*, is of little importance: for every one knows ſubſequent *Councils* have alwaies been ſo far from thinking it unlawful to add to the former, that ſuch additions are the very buſineſs and end of

their

their aſſembling: and yet (as the ſeventh *Council* teſtify'd) they confirm'd all that was either in Scripture or Tradition, by binding us to theſe two pillars of truth.

He is farther troubled, that divers Provinces ſhould out of St. *Hierom*'s authority, eſteem the commands they finde have been in uſe among their forefathers, to be inſtitutions deriv'd from the Apoſtles: as if either the Apoſtles might not have left divers cuſtoms, in divers places; for ſome practices of leſs concernment; or that, in St. *Hieroms* time, it was ſo hard to know when a cuſtom of importance ſtarted, if it began ſince the Apoſtles; which could be ſcarce three hundred yeers.

In the laſt *Chapter* of his firſt Book he thinks it impoſſible to know the belief of the *ancient Church*, either univerſal or particular, touching any point of controverſies now debated among us. And truly, as he underſtands the queſtion, he ſeems to have ſome reaſon: for, he profeſſes that all the poſitive evidence out of Antiquity comes ſhort of ſatisfying him, unleſs we can make good that no one did in thoſe daies ſecretly hold the contrary; a proof that certainly none but a mad man would either expect of another, or himſelf attempt.

Nevertheleſs; this he exacts of us, and

therfore cites St. *Hierom* for the equality of Prieſts and Biſhops: though he writes expreſly againſt it, and the place he cites clearly ſpeaks of the confuſion of the names of *Presbyter* and *Epiſcopus*. Likewiſe, when St. *Hierom* teſtify's ſome Biſhops held with *Vigilantius*, he thinks that ſufficient to make St. *Hieroms* ſide not univerſal: as if *Biſhops* could not be *Hereticks*. He adds, St. *Hierom*, by his paſſionate ſpeeches againſt *Vigilantius*, derogats from the authority of his teſtimony. I believe him, if he ſpeaks of his own party, who are eaſily perſwaded to diminiſh the credit of Fathers: but not, if he mean among Catholicks, who think the modern Heretiks no better then *Vigilantius* and his followers.

Thus have we briefly paſs'd over his firſt Book.

THE SIXTH SURVEY.

How the Authority of Fathers is infallible.

Yet theſe laſt five Chapters and the whole next Book will put us to the pains of expli-

explicating what Authority *Catholiks* give the Fathers, towards decision of controversies; and how they are to argue out of them, if they intend to conclude any opposite opinion an Heresy.

To be as short and clear in this point as I can; I shall begin with some propositions wherin I believe, all sides agree. First, that the Fathers, as particular Authors, might erre; and no one's single testimony, how eminent soever, is sufficient to make a *necessary Verity*, upon the sole account of being his judgment. Secondly, that seldom or never, in any controversy, the *Fathers*, cited for one part, are so many, as to make the doctrin deliver'd a matter of *Faith*, out of this precise reason that *it is their opinion*: For, though their multitude should arrive to the full sum of three hundred, yet it exceeds not the number of *Heretiks*, nay, even *Heretik Bishops*, who unanimously conspir'd to oppose the Catholick Faith. If then, all certainty of things contingent and fallible, in their individuals, depend upon *universality*; and the number we discourse of, though great, yet consider'd in its own immediate force, make but a particular: it cleerly follows, No question can be evidently convinc'd by the pure numerosity of produced Fathers. Thus far I conceive both par-

ties are bound to conſent.

My third propoſition therfore is, If a certain number of *Fathers* be ſufficient to convince the *univerſality* of an opinion in the *Church*; how little ſoever that number be, 'tis ſtrong enough to ſupport an *Article of Faith*: not becauſe it is their opinion, but the *Churches*; atteſted by them to be the Faith of the Church, and by the Church to be Chriſts. And thus remains declared what Authority Catholiks attribute to the *Fathers* in reference to deciding Controverſy's.

The next point is, about the exerciſe of this Authority: how a Catholick writer may, by the teſtimony of *Fathers*, conclude the general Faith of the Church, and, conſequently, the *infallibility* of the point controverted. For which we muſt lay theſe grounds. Firſt, that it has always been the nature of the *Catholik Church*, to decline *communion* with thoſe Churches ſhe eſteem'd erroneons in any material point; as, Idolatry, Superſtition, and the like, upon which pretences, our modern preſumers for *Reformation* have ſeparated themſelvs from the preſent Catholik Church: wherfore, if there be convincing teſtimonies, that any one particular Church (ſo known and conſiderable that the neighbouring Provinces muſt

muſt needs take notice of its publick cuſtoms) embraces any doctrin or practice, yet remains ſtill peaceably in communion with the *Univerſal*; 'tis therby convinc'd the *whole* Catholick Church held the ſame not to be Idolatrous, Superſtitious, &c. If then the point be of ſuch a nature, that one part of the contradiction muſt neceſſarily be receiv'd, and the other rejected, it unavoydably follows, the whole Church in that Age was of the ſame judgment with the particular one.

Nor is the evidence of this propoſition built upon ſome ſcrap of an ancient Writer miſ-interpreted, as our Adverſaries would infer the contrary from three lines of *Hegeſippus*; but upon the eſſential notion of the *Church*, which is to be the conſerver of Chriſts doctrin, upon the whole body of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, which contains nothing but either the propagation of the faith or the expulſion of thoſe that would corrupt it; And laſtly, upon the univerſality of Chriſtian writers, whoſe profeſſion and buſineſſe it has always been to inſtruct the Church in the doctrin of Chriſt and oppoſe all abuſes that offer'd to inſinuate themſelvs under the name of reformation, or whatever other ſpecious mask Hereſy has put on, to cover the ilfavordneſs of her face.

And now we may ſafely proceed to the ſecond ground, that if the teſtimony of Fathers convince the quiet poſſeſſion of any doctrin in one age, it concludes the ſame of all ages that are known to communicate with it: which is, in effect, with all precedent and ſubſequent Ages whom either that acknowledges, or who acknowledg that for their Teacher and Miſtreſs. This conſequence from the former principle is ſo evident, that I may boldly, yet without preſumption infer, if we can prove one Age, we prove all.

But to make it plainer: let me borrow out of our Adverſaries ingenuity, that the ſame doctrin has endur'd theſe thouſand years; which reſtrains our controverſy only to the firſt ſix hundred: and that common ſenſe cannot ſay Popery was rank in the ſixth Age, but it muſt have been well grown in the fifth; which will ſtill contract our ſtrife, to the compaſs of four hundred years: wherof, three were undoubtedly acknowledg'd Parents and Miſtreſſes of the fourth, and the fourth of two or three following; one of which is confeſt, to be univerſally over-run with Popery. So that, we need no more pains, but only to prove that ſome one Age of the firſt ſix hundred years embrac'd any doctrin (of a nature ſubſtantial and conſi-

derable

derable as is above expreſt) to convince all the reſt of the ſame belief: elſe the Adverſary muſt ſhew the latter Age diſavowing the faith of their Anceſtors, and anathematizing it as heretical, and in the ſame or equivalent terms, as our late Reformers cry out againſt the Catholik unity, or Catholicks againſt their diviſion. For, if the younger Ages reverence and plead conformity with the ancienter: 'tis impoſſible they ſhould have changed any doctrin of importance or neceſſity.

My third ground is, that when we ſpeak of the Faith of the *Church*, we intend not to ſay, No ſingle perſon may think otherwiſe or be ignorant of it, and yet live bodily and exteriourly in the communion of that Church: but we ſpeak of the profeſſed and publick belief of all, both Clergy and Laity which meet at Gods ſervice in ſuch a Church: As all that meet at *Charanton* are ſuppoſed to agree in the Articles, which the Kings Edicts permit to be held by the pretenders to Reformation; Yet I believe there are few Engliſhmen who conſent to all, though they reſort thither: So that, by this poſition, it may ſtand with the general or univerſal faith of one part of the contradiction, that ſome few maintain the oppoſite Judgment: By theſe three grounds,

you

you wil finde moſt of his doubts and pretended difficulties, in the five laſt chapters, taken away, and the poſſibility of demonſtrating a point out of the Fathers rendred very apparent and practicable: wherfore we have now a little leaſure to ſhake out his other bundle of Rags, and ſee whether we can eſpy any thing there, that may entangle a weak Divine.

THE SEVENTH SURVEY.

Of the four firſt Chapters of his ſecond Book: wherin he pretends, The Fathers gave wrong notions of the Faith of the Church; and that they ſpake not like Judges.

THis Chapter he begins very modeſtly, and ſays, the Fathers teſtimonies of the Churches Faith are not alwaies true: His firſt example is in that queſtion, Whether our ſoul comes by creation or from our Parents; in which, St. *Hierom* brings the verdict of the Churches againſt *Ruffinus*: but 'tis evident, this objection fails, becauſe we

we doubt not ſome one or few learned men may hold againſt the *tenet* of the Church they live in.

His ſecond exception he cites out of *Johannes Theſſalon*, whom he makes in his tranſlation, ſay, the Church held Angels had ſubtile and aery bodies; but in his marginal Greek (a language few underſtand, and ſo not many are like to diſcover his art) there is no ſuch thing: only this, that the Church knows Angels to be *intelligent creatures*, but not whither they are incorporeal or have ſubtile bodies.

His third inſtance is, where *Petavius* reprehends St. *Epiphanius*, for ſaying, It was an Apoſtolical Tradition to meet thrice a week to communicate: I doubt wrongfully; For what probability can there be, that ſome Apoſtle ſhould not have left ſuch a Cuſtom in ſome *Province*, if it were on foot in St. *Epiphanius* his time? beſides, this *Petavius* is noted for an eaſie cenſurer of his betters; nor does the matter deſerve any farther inſpection.

The next he borrows from the ſame Authour, againſt *Venerable Bede*; and 'tis a meer equivocation, upon the ambiguity of this word *fides*: which may ſignifie an *Hiſtorical perſwaſion*, or a *Traditional certitude*; in which laſt ſenſe *Petavius* took it, where-

as

as *Venerable Bede* pronounced it in the former.

His ſecond Chapter tels us, the *Fathers* confeſs they are not to be believ'd upon thsir own bare words. Where I muſt intreat my Reader, to obſerve, that, If the Fathers he brings ſpeak of one or few, we acknowledge they are not to be truſted on their word; and ſo, have no controverſie with him; But, if he would make them ſpeak of the whole Collection, he cites nothing to the purpoſe; but all he brings, reach no farther then the firſt ſenſe; and have no oppoſition with the ſaying of others, who command us to follow the doctrin and even the words of our Anceſtors. He is offended with *Sozomen*, for ſaying, None of the Ancients ever affirm'd, the Son of God had any beginning of his generation; conſidering certain paſſages of theirs, which yet himſelf has confeſſed before, that St. *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, and others have cleared from any ſuch ſenſe.

He calumniats an excellent place of *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*, explicating what the univerſality of Fathers means, and how their ſentence is of force. His firſt quarrel is, that *Lyrinenſis* requirs, they muſt have lived and died both for doctrin and manners, in the communion of the Catholik Church; which,

which, he ſays, cannot be known, unleſs firſt we are ſure their doctrin was ſound: Not ſeeing alas, that their living and dying with reputation of Sanctity, gives them this honourable prejudice, To be eſteem'd, both for life and doctrin, ſincere and unſuſpected Catholiks, til the contrary be proved.

His ſecond quarrel is againſt the number *Lyrinenſis* aſſigns to be, al or the greateſt part: which certainly is meant of Authors then extant, who had written in ſome age before the controverſie aroſe; wherof, ſuch a number as may make us underſtand what was the belief of that Age, is ſufficient; all the reſt being *ad abundantiam.* For 'tis plain, *Lyrinenſis* held clearly the Catholik opinion, that *the Church never periſhed*; and conſequently, the Faith of one Age was, with him, the faith of all. But, this good gueſſer would perſwade us no ſuch evidence can be had; and inſtead of proof, makes this wild conjecture, that for ought he knows the greateſt part of the *Fathers* was of the contrary mind to thoſe we have extant: which is juſt ſuch an argument, as if one ſhould ſuppoſe that were all the Roman Writers extant, perhaps the greateſt part would tel us, *Pompey* overthrew *Ceſar*, and that the *Roman Empire* was alwaies after govern'd by

a Senate and *Tribuni plebis*, til the *Goths* overran it.

His third Exception is againſt thoſe conditions, That the Fathers muſt have ſaid or teſtified ſuch a truth clearly, often, and conſtantly; which he thinks impoſſible to be found: but let him leave that to the Actors. He therfore rather chuſes to ſide with St. *Auſtin*: but what ſays he? He tels *Julian* the *Pelagian*, *Puto tibi eam partem orbis ſufficere debere, in quâ primum Apoſtolorum ſuorum voluit Dominus glorioſiſſimo Martyrio coronari*; this, after he had cited the teſtimonies of only Latin Fathers: But when he had cited Fathers of both Churches, he argues thus: *Si Epiſcopalis Synodus ex toto orbe congregaretur, mirum ſi tales poſſent illic facile tot ſedere, quia nec iſti uno tempore fuerunt; ſed fideles & multis excellentiores, paucos diſpenſatores ſuos Deus per diverſas ætates, temporum, locorumque diſtantias, ſicut ei placet atque expediri judicat, ipſe diſpenſat. Hos itaque de aliis atque aliis temporibus atque Regionibus ab Oriente & Occidente congregatos vides, &c.* In which Diſcourſe St. *Auſtin* taking for a principle, that the Writers in any age are ordinarily of the moſt eminent for learning, and indeed of ſo high a degree, that we cannot expect many ſuch at the ſame time, concludes the conſent of *Fathers*, which he had cited, more

aſſured

aſſured and ſatisfactory then a General Council: Now, what apprehenſion he had of a General Council, is wel known to any, who has made a little acquaintance with that Saints writings.

Fain alſo would this pious man fix the ſlander, upon *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*, of being a *Semi-Pelagian*, out of far fetch'd ſurmiſes; which I pardon him, becauſe that Father ſits very hard upon his and his brethren-Separatiſts skirts.

In the enſuing chapter his pretence is to ſhew the Fathers did not write like Judges ſitting upon a Bench to give ſentence; a cavil which neither any wil diſpute with him, nor is to his purpoſe: But, by the purſuit it appears, he only rang'd about for an occaſion to vilifie the Fathers, by citing or publiſhing a catalogue of ſuch weakneſſes as he had eſpyd in them. The firſt he notes, is of *Haſt* they uſed in their works; the next ſome miſtakes in *Chronology* or *Hiſtory*, wherof one I cannot omit, becauſe he lays it upon them all generally, That *Nilus* was one of the Rivers mention'd to water *Paradiſe:* againſt which he cals for witneſſe *Scaliger* and *Petavius*; the former of whom I cannot blame, ſeeing he was not born to reverence the *Fathers*; the other in this confirms the cenſuring humour before ſpoken of in him:

But,

But, for the opinion it ſelf, it is very true, as may appear in the *Appendix* to *Inſtitutiones Peripateticæ*.

Afterwards he nibbles at their *Philoſophy* and *Grammar*; then, accuſes their weak *memories*; laſtly, quarrels with their *Allegorical* explications. Surely, if he had found an exact hiſtory of their lives, he would have chid ſome of them for wanting good Voyees, or being but indifferent Muſitians, or not having learnt in the French Academies to dance, fence, and complement *a la mode*.

THE EIGHTH SURVEY.

Of the two laſt Chapters of his ſecond Book: wherein he ſays many Fathers have agreed in the ſame Errours; and objects certain vanities between the Ancient and Modern Church.

IN his *fourth Chapter* he propoſes, that the *Fathers* have not only err'd ſingly, but whole Troops of them together: which though it be nothing to the purpoſe,

as

as not touching the preciſe point controverted betwixt us, ſince the Fathers authority is from their concurrence in *atteſting an univerſal Belief as witneſſes*, and not in *delivering* their *Judgment as Doctors*; Yet has our Gallant beſtir'd himſelf notably in this point, becauſe his true intention was to take all reverence from the Fathers, though he cunningly with a ſmooth tongue profeſſes the contrary. But he has another piece of *legier-de-main*, very proper to abuſe an unwary Reader; For he neither diſtinguiſhes the quality of errours, whither in Faith, Philoſophy, or Hiſtory, nor their degree, and ſo makes the good ſilly people of his Sect conceive, every miſtake of any Father an errour, and every errour a groſs one; knowing that, when he mentions the word *errour* in relation to the Fathers, all his *Hugonots* preſently imagin it to be in doctrin, and great enough to condemn and forſake them. Beſides, he never thinks of explicating what *many* ſignify's in reſpect to the number of the Fathers, ſo that, three or four may paſs with him for a multitude.

Another jugling trick he has to caſt any ſhadow of words into ſuch a poſture, that they ſeem clearly convinc'd of errour. As, if a *Father* ſay, God governs the World by Angels; he'l make it ſound, as if God knew not

not what was done here below. Then, of his own accord hee'l take for granted divers positions, as if they were confest errours, which are first to be proved such; as, That some souls are kept in Receptacles till the day of Judgment, &c. The length of the Chapter and its confusednes in not distinguishing private errours from publick, and the multitude of his mistakes, favourable to his own side, deter me from spending my time upon the false proofs of a confessed, or at least not controverted Conclusion: For truly, if I would take the pains, I doubt not to make appear, the greatest part of them are as weak as malicious, towards the scandalizing those great Persons he calumniat's.

But because St. *Hierom* is accounted by the Sectaries their special friend, and one that spares not to give them the truth home; this grateful man in counterchange, spends four whole leavs in his cõmendation, as you may understand by his general judgment upon him: telling us that *the cours he ordinarily uses in his disputations, is wresting the words of his Adversarys quite besides the Authors intention; and framing to himself such a sense as is not at all to be found in them: and then fiercly encountring this Gyant of his own making, mixing withal base abusive Language and biting*

girds,

girds, and the like tart expreſſions borrow'd from Prophane Authors, in which kind of learning he was indeed very excellent. Of this modeſt cenſure he pretends no leſs then one example for proof, and that far ſhort of juſtifying his bold imputation. The miſchance was that in a certain controverſy betwixt St. *Auſtin* and him, he miſtook at firſt St. *Auſtins* meaning, from whence this charitable Interpreter ſuſpects he never delt any better with others; and after the ſentence ſo impudently pronounc'd, rely's upon this bare ſuſpition as a ſufficient evidence.

Then he proceeds to another game he plays very much at, call'd calumny, and charges the ſame *Father* firſt about Gods knowing ſmal things: but it is apparent out of the very citation that St. *Hieroms* intention is not of ſpeculative knowledg, but particular providence, of which St. *Paul* ſaid, *nunquid Deo cura eſt de bobus?* His ſecond inſtance contradicts his former; For it is, that Saints are everywhere; which is ſpoken of their knowledg, not corporal preſence: Chriſt, by whoſe company, they are pretended to be everywhere, being ſo by his ſight and knowledg, not by his preſence corporally: Which this Friend ſaw was contrary to the former, yet would not make uſe of it to reconcile, but aggravate the er-

rours. Thirdly he accuſes him to ſay, that the Souls of the bleſſed *Saints* and *Angels* are ſubject to ſin: but cites not a ſyllable, except for *Angels*, which ſo expreſs'd, is an undenyable truth, being no more then that *Angels* by envy, became *Divels*.

But his irreconcilable quarrel is againſt *marriage* and what St. *Hierom* writes of *Ladies* reſpects to their families: that *they did not marry the ſecond time*, he interprets as intended againſt *marriage* it ſelf. I confeſs, as concerning the act of *marriage* or appetite to it, he ſays more what is true, then perhaps what is convenient to be ſpoken before Perſons that ſhould not be dehorted from a thing ſo neceſſary in divers caſes, wherin the temperance, not uſe is honourable. He goes on and now charges this old ſevere Father with a ſcandalous doctrin indeed, an intolerable hereſy, wherin all true Reform'd ſtomacks are fundamentally concern'd; for he accuſes him to ſay in expreſs terms that eating of fleſh (a moſt wholſome cuſtome) was aboliſh'd by *Jeſus Chriſt*; but, citing neither words nor place, and afterward drawing it in by a falſ conſequence, makes me ſuſpect it is an arrant forgery. Again he accuſes him of ſaying oaths were unlawful: but in truth the words of the very *Scripture* are harder, then St. *Hieroms*. The

next

next errour is, that he thought the validity of consecration depended on the sanctity of the Priest: but his words are so common they easily receive explica tion. Again, he is offended with him for denying faintly, that the blessed eat in Heaven.

Lastly, he accuses him of abusing St. *Paul*; and first of contradicting him about the inscription of the *Athenian Altar:* because he says there was more in the inscription, then the *Apostle* mention'd; Secondly that he said, he understood more then he could explicate. Thirdly that to the *Galathians* he spake ordinary discourses, because they were not capable of higher. Of these three the first had no harm in it, since all the Evangelists do not cite the whole title of our *Saviours* Cross, the two latter Dignify a great commendation of St. *Paul* among wise men and such as understand there is any other learning besides well speaking.

I must not pass without one word of *Ruffinus* too: because our Reformers account of so fundamental a passage of his, in the interpretation of the Canons of the Council of *Nice* touching the Popes *authority*: And this great Patron of theirs cals him *an arrant wooden Statue*; *A pitiful thing*; *One that had scarce any reason* in what he said, and yet much less dexterity in defending himself.

Muſt not then what is grounded upon his property and excellency of language, be a perfect foundation for a point of faith? By theſe you may gueſs how he has dealt with others, which were too long to examin.

Approaching to the end of his *Chapter*, he ſpecify's ſome errours unanimouſly held by a juſt number of the *Fathers*. Firſt, that of the *Chiliaſts*; an objection already anſwered in the former part of this diſcourſe. The ſecond is, the reſervation of ſouls from heaven *till the day of Judgment*; which is refuted in a little Treatiſe entitled, *De medio animarum ſtatu*: The third concerns *rebaptization of Heteticks*; which alſo is cleared above: only I cannot forget how he would inſinuate that St. *Baſil* held it, after the deciſion of the Council of *Nice*; but his mincing the matter, by ſaying *in a manner*, ſhews it is only a largeſs of his good will, and not any evidence he brings. Next he urges fiercly a point of *Chronology*; and then, the *Angels* having *bodies*; and after that, the *Angels* falling in love *with women*: three points not very material. Then again, he repeats the *neceſſity* of the *Euchariſt* to *Infants*; but brings in rather teſtimonies of the practice, which is not in queſtion, then of the neceſſity, which is: And laſtly, that all the *Greek Fathers* and a great part of the Latins held

held Gods *foreſight* of mens good and bad *works* to be the cauſe of *predeſtination*; but his authority depending only on modern Writers ſaying ſo, whoſe diligence in examining their meanings is not known, it might as wiſely have been omitted.

In this next *Chapter*, he intends to prove that ſome *Fathers* have ſtrongly maintain'd, againſt others, ſome opinions in matters of very great importance; which is but one half of what follows from, or rather is directly contain'd in, the concluſion of the former Chapter, and therfore, not denyed by us nor uſeful to him: which was the cauſe why he would not there add (though the place were very proper) that they defended ſuch opinions againſt the whole current of others, and of the Church. But to make a ſeeming new argument, he left out this, and expreſt himſelf generally, like a true deceiver, that ſome defended againſt others: and to give his diſcourſ the better reliſh, he begins his antipaſt with calumniating *Beſſarion*, making him ſay that the Fathers opinions never claſh one againſt another, touching the points of our Religion (for a Perſon ſo learned could not be ignorant, that ſome errour might be found in a *Father* againſt the cõmon conſent of the reſt:) But, his meaning was, that not ſo many could diſſent, as were

able to make a party againſt the general agreeing judgment of the reſt; neither does our Informer ſeek to prove the contrary.

In his firſt inſtance, if he had put in, that *Juſtin*, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* had held the *Millenary Hereſy*, againſt the communalty of Chriſtians of their Age, he had ruin'd his own proof; which, nevertheleſs he might have done out of *Juſtinus*, (as is declared) and indeed was obliged to do, if he intended to proceed pertinently. But what ſhould I pain my ſelf in a queſtion not controverted? Only I cannot omit a ſubtlety he uſes againſt St. *Cyril* and *Theodoret*. St. *Cyril* had ſaid, *The Holy Ghoſt was proper to the Son.* *Theodoret* diſtinguiſhes his words, ſaying, if he means *by proper proceeding as well as the Son*, or, *of the ſame nature*, ſo he allows the ſaying: but, if he means that he proceeded *from or by the Son only* (both which terms were then in uſe; for this and nothing elſ can be ſignify'd by *proper* added to *from* or *by*) then he condemn'd St. *Cyrils* doctrin. Now our ſly Interpreter would make *Theodoret* condemn this ſaying, *that the Holy Ghoſt proceeded from the Son.*

His laſt reaſon is one that makes all the reſt impertinent; and ſhews they were dilated only to vilify the *Saints* and the *Church*, whoſe Crown they are, and the *Founder* of

the

the Church, who glorify'd himſelf in Them and Her: 'Tis, that the Church of *Rome* and Proteſtants agree in the poſition he ſeemed to labour at ſo hard; what need or occaſion had he then to rave into the *Fathers* about a point wherin there is not the leaſt difference among us?

Next, he excepts at our Controvertiſts, for alledging the *Fathers* againſt them; ſince we know they receive not the Fathers. I anſwer, there is by nature planted in all honeſt diſpoſitions, ſuch a reſpect to their Anceſtors; that, though the malicious part of their congregation, and this Sophiſter in chief, cry down *Antiquity*, as loud as they can, yet ſhal they never be able wholly to root out of the hearts and conſciences of the generality of Chriſtians, that eſteem and reverence which they naturally bear in their Breaſts towards the Fathers of Chriſtianity; So that our Controvertiſts cite writings of thoſe ancient and holy Doctors, not in reference to the enſoured and barbarous party of Hereticks; but for their ſakes, who yet retain ſome ſpirits of goodneſs and Chriſtian humanity in them.

Then he brings divers ſayings of *Moderns* to prove the Authorities of *Fathers* are not irreſiſtible, eſpecially in the interpretation of Scripture; among which one ſomthing inſolent

ſolent. Afterwards, he reckons the varieties betwixt the ancient and preſent Church; ſome in Ceremonies, ſome in Diſciplin, and ſome, as he pretends, in Belief: theſe later we have touch'd before; the two former, for the moſt part, we make no difficulty to acknowledge, ſince the prudential diſpoſure of ſuch diſcretionary points fals cleerly within the verge of the Churches juriſdiction.

But here I particularly invite the Ey of the ſerious Reader, to obſerve how maliciouſly he corrupts the Council of *Trent*, in two very conſiderable paſſages: one, where he ſays, *It anathematizes whoever ſhall deny that Biſhops are a higher Order then Prieſts:* wheras in the Latin (which himſelf has the boldneſs to cite truly in the Margin) ther's no ſuch word to be found as *Order*; but only that Biſhops are *ſuperiores Presbyteris*, a phraſe implying no neceſſiy at all of their being ſeveral Orders; though in that word conſiſts the whole emphaſis of his falſ imputation.

His other abuſe is yet more groſs and palpable, concerning our Ladies immaculate Conception; for the Council expreſly declaring their intention was not to meddle with the Queſtion, he ſays *'tis impoſſible ſo to expound their words that they ſhall in plain terms*

give

give the ly to all the Fathers: and to render this foul play the more plauſible among ſuch as look not wel to his fingers, he tranſlates *in hoc decreto* falſly and perverſly *in this number*, as if the Council had poſitively decreed the Bleſſed Virgin not to be in the *number* of thoſe who are born in original ſin; when their very words directly tel him they on purpoſe reſolv'd to preſcind from her particular Caſe, and not determin any thing concerning It in that *Decree*. Certainly, had this man either face or conſcience, an ordinary malice could never have engag'd him into ſuch a deſperate abſurdity, ſo notorious, that its practice cannot be unknown even to him, though he ſhut his Eyes againſt the light; ſince all diſputers upon this point unanimouſly agree, that the Council intended wholy to abſtract from the queſtion, and leave both ſides probable! nevertheleſs this ſhameleſs forehead dares, in ſuch broad and unmannerly language, not only ſlander a grave and venerable Council, but outface the whol Catholick world. What truſt can be given to ſo bold a Jugler in matters either of leſs moment or leſs evidence; when in a Caſe ſo important, as the Decree of a Council, and ſo palpably manifeſt, that all that can read may eaſily diſcover the cheat, yet he bluſhes not

not to venter on't? can any thing be answered in his defence, or any excuse made, why he should not be accounted an impudent lying knave?

THE NINTH SURVEY.

In answer to two Questions, in his last Chapter; One, the Fathers being rejected, to what Judg we ought to recur: The other, what use is to be made of the Fathers?

ALl this while our new Edifyer of the reform'd Temple has us'd only his Sword-hand to keep off those dangerous enemies the *Fathers*; now he begins to manage his trowel, and bedawb the face of antiquity with a little fine morter: Let's see at least what work he makes; though we have smal reason to expect any good building from him that is not able so much as to pull down.

Thus then, workman-like, he enters upon his task; demanding of himself this question, *the Fathers being rejected, where shall we*

now

now lay our foundation? to what Rule or Judge muſt we have recourſe? He anſwers, *To the Scripture*; and if in any one place it ſeem obſcure, we muſt then ſeek out another to clear it. Which firſt ſuppoſes, that for all points neceſſary, there are ſome evident and clearing Texts: But I muſt ask, on what Authority he believes this? doth the Scripture declare it ſo plainly, that ther's no debate about it? He knows the whole Catholik Church denys any ſuch ſelf-evident alſufficiency in Scripture. Did they, who delivered him and his Brethren the Bible, recommend it to them under this qualification? No: for his party went out of the Catholik Church, and receiv'd the Scriptures from none but Her, who never taught them any ſuch leſſon. Perhaps you'l ſay, all other Chriſtians teſtify'd the verity of that book, and ſo upon their credit you are the more induc'd to accept it. But thoſe Chriſtians are ſuch as your ſelvs generally condemn: ſuch as have been caſt out, for taking this very propoſition, to juſtifie their rebellion againſt *Her*, whom you acknowledge, then, to have been the true Owner and Miſtris of Chriſts Doctrin. Beſides, any one that has but half an Ey may ſee, no *Scripture-diſputation* with Heretiks was ever finiſht, without new reply's; but the *Church*

has

has alwaies been forc'd at last to condemn them, upon the score of *Tradition*. Thus you borrow'd this desperate device, from those who in all ages were *thrust out of the same Church*, for holding the very *same principles*.

But suppose there were some clear Texts in our Controversies (as we think there are in disfavour of you;) may they not be rendred obscure by other places objected against them; which we pretend you endeavour to doe. If so, your remedy is worse then the evil; and the comparing of divers places is the very cause that makes all balanceable, indifferent and obscure. Are we not now reduc'd to a hopeful condition of living hereafter in a perpetual and unavoidable unity of Religion: especially since an hundred yeers experience sadly demonstrates what we say to be true?

Besides, why does not this good Orator spend some time to shew us, that his Arguments have not as much force against *Scripture*, as against the *Fathers*? I confess, he has hinted it sometimes; like one that saw the objection so obvious, it could not be forgotten: yet was unwilling to wade the Ford, for fear he should find it too deep. To supply therfore his omission, I shall observe one considerable difference betwixt the

Scrip-

Scripture and *Fathers*, as far as concerns these objections. Which consists in this, that the Fathers works are many and copious; The Scriptures bulk every Maid can tell that carry's her Mistresses Book to Church. Whence it follows, that, as in a great Ocean there may be many Shelvs and Rocks, and Whirlpools, and whatever else is frightful to Sea men, and yet nevertheless a fair and large passage remain, either not at all endammaged by these perillous adventures, or only so, that they are easily avoyded by a careful Pilot: wheras in a narrow Channel or Frith, if we meet but half the number, there will be no sailing without manifest danger; So I conceive between the *Fathers* and the *Scripture*. Every exception this Caviller alledges (or at least provs) may be true of their works, and yet more then sufficient left to convince Hereticks: but if Scripture be half as much disabled, it wil utterly lose its Protestant, pretended power of deciding controversys.

A truth I believe *Rushworth* has abundantly demonstrated. For the *variæ lectiones* are so many that they trench upon every line; the several *Translations* give some little difference to every sentence; the many *Explications* leave nothing untouch'd; the *Comparisons* of one place to another may be more

then

then there are words in the Text; the places brought by one side and the other, so short that *Equivocation* has force upon every one; the *Languages* in which they are written either *Hebrew*, whose titles breed a difference; or *Greek* written by strangers and full of *Improprieties*; the *Method* and *Stile*, the many repetitions and occasionary discourses speak plainly the design of the Apostles far different from intending their writings should contain a full body of Religion, much less to be the sole Judg to determin all contentions about faith.

Yes wil he say, but there are more objections against the Fathers then against the Scripture. As that the writings of the Fathers for the first three Ages are few; I confess it: but yet dare affirm, there is more of them then the whole Scripture makes. That the Fathers treat of matters different from our controversy's; This is true, but so do the Scriptures. That there are suppositious works of the Fathers: Hereticks pretend the same against our Scriptures. That the Fathers speak according to others minds; But the like is found in Scripture. And so going on, it will easily appear, the same objections or equivalent, might have bin made against Scripture, if Mr. *Rushworth* had thought them worthy the labour of setting down. Now,

Now, when theſe Books are put into a Vulgar language (as is neceſſary to them, who pretend every one ſhould be judge of their belief out of Scripture, by being firſt Judge of the ſenſe of it, that is, of *what is Scripture*, for the dead letter is nothing to the purpoſe) can it be leſs then madnes, to think of demonſtrating a controverted poſition out of one or two places of Scripture? And yet (as I have before noted) this *Patron* of *Presbytery* aſſures us, that we ought to believe nothing in point of Religion, but what we know to be certainly true; which is evident, in his way, to be nothing at all.

At laſt his own good nature has perſwaded him to propoſe one profitable queſtion, What uſe is to be made of Fathers for deciding Controverſies? And his firſt reſolution is (in the deſign of his Book, conformable to the fore-layd grounds) *that we ought to read them carefully and heedfully ſearching their Writings for their opinions, and not for our own.* A wonderful wiſe concluſion; eſpecially conſidering, he ſays, the Reader muſt endeavour diligently to peruſe them all. For my part, I ſhould adviſe my friend rather to take his reſt and ſleep, then ſpend ſo much pains and time to ſearch out what others have written; which, when I have found, little imported

ported what twas, or whether I knew it or no: this being the idleſt and unworthieſt ſort of ſtudy, to know what ſuch or ſuch books ſay, without any farther end. Yet generally this is the great learning theſe Grammatical Divines glory in, not that they are better, even at this, then their Adverſaries, but becauſe they have no other: As if they had forgotten there were any ſolid knowledg to be ſought after; but, being blown like a thin empty glaſs into the windy ſubſtance of words, hang in the air, not having weight enough to ſettle upon firm ground.

At leaſt to maintain, the *Fathers* are not altogether vain and uſeleſs, he will teach us to argue *negatively* out of their writings; as that ſuch a poſition is not found in the Fathers, *Ergo* not neceſſary to be believ'd: and by this to reduce our Faith to that number of Articles, which they unanimonſly deliver. But he has forgot his own arguments: for ſince we have ſo few of their works, how can we tel the greater part did not teach ſomwhat neceſſary to be believ'd, which theſe have omitted? ſince corruption enter'd into the Church immediatly after the Apoſtles deceaſe; why may not ſome conſiderable point be ſtrangled in its infancy? ſince the Fathers are ſo hard to be underſtood; why may there not be many

doctrins

doctrins of importance, which we find not for want of quickneſs of ſight to diſcover them? and ſince they oppoſe one another in ſo many things, why may not, at leaſt ſome one of theſe be a fundamental Article of Faith?

I cannot give over this diſcourſ concerning the teſtimony of the Fathers, without firſt obſerving a notorious cheat of our Adverſary's, and too great an eaſineſs in our own party: which once diſcover'd and perfectly underſtood, makes our cauſe ſo evident, that in my opinion there will be left no poſſibility of diſputing about Antiquity. The buſineſs is this, Wheras their breach from the old Religion is ſo apparent and viſible, ther's not the leaſt colour to doubt it; we let our ſelvs by their cunning be drawn into dark and petty queſtions: and ſo loſe the face of Antiquity, by diſputing of ſome nice point. As for example; when the *Presbyterian* has ruin'd the whole fabrick of the ancient Church by taking away Epiſcopal Authority; inſtead of queſtioning them for ſo palpable an innovation, we unwarily ſuffer our ſelvs to be engag'd into the diſcuſſion of this particular *quære*; *Whether Biſhops be de jure divino?* which cannot be determin'd by the vaſt body of Antiquity

(as the right and proper queſtion may, to wit, *what is the true government of the Church?*) but by minute canvaſing of private Texts, which is a far more difficult and altogether unneceſſary method.

Juſt ſo it happens in almoſt all Controverſy's. For no doubt but Deciſion of matters of Faith was anciently perform'd in *Councils*, if the ſcandal grew ſo high as to force ſuch general meetings: Theſe, Hereticks abſolutely renounce, preferring their private conceits before the judgment of all the Biſhops in the world; and then, if you preſs them with the palpable abſurdity of ſo inſolent and deſtructive a tenet, they preſently caſt a figure, and, inſtead of handling the plain duty of obedience to the ſupream Eccleſiaſtical Authority, transform the queſtion into a meer ſpeculative ſubtlety as, *Wherin conſiſts the infallibility of Councils?* For the *Maſs*, our Reformers take it quite away, everywhere breaking down the Altars and aboliſhing the whole Glory of Gods ſervice, which is unqueſtionably ancient; ſo many Liturgy's to this day, and the general practice of the Church ſtil continuing: This done, they wil diſpute of the antiquity of the word *Miſſa* or *Tranſubſtantiatio*. For the Popes authority, they at one ſtroak

ſtroak cut a pieces the ligue and common bond of Chriſtianity in the unity of one head, and force us to wrangle, either about his *infallibility*, or whether his power of *Appeals* be from Church-Laws or Chriſts commands; and the like. They blot out the memories of *Martyrs* both in their ſolemn Feaſts and Tombs: things undiſputable in the glorious flouriſhing of the Church: and quarrel about what honour is due to their Lives, Reliques and Pictures. They diſclaim the publick practice of *praying for the dead*, everywhere frequented, they deny the univerſal profeſſion of *Purgatory*, in all ages avow'd, and then turn their exceptions upon *How* and *When* our prayers obtain their effect. They pul down *Monaſteries* and *Nunnery's*, and abandon the extraordinary and exemplary way of holy life, which no impudence can deny to have been practis'd all the time the Church it ſelf has bin publick; and then diſpute, whether St. *John Baptiſt* or the *Eſſeni* were Religious men or no, or when *Vows* came firſt in.

Hypocrits! if you reverence *Antiquity*, reſtore the face of Antiquity. If you truly honour *Jeſus Chriſt* and his *Saints*, and *vertuous life*, and any thing but an Ear-itch to be claw'd by the phraſe of *Scripture*, embrace

what has been Christian life from the beginning. If not, fill up the measure of your *first Reformers* till the Judgments of God overtake you and make you pay the whol reckoning, for theirs and your own dissembling.

I fear I have already wearied the patience of my Reader, I am sure I have long since quite tir'd my own: being unwillingly drawn by the many turns and windings of the subtle Fox I pursue, far beyond the cours intended at the beginning. To conclude then at last: I doubt not but he, who has not perus'd Mr. *Daille's* Book, will nevertheless, out of what I say, see plainly those Noble Lords, whose *Elogies* are posted before it, had great reason highly to esteem him. For truly his nimble *Wit*, his exact *Method*, his polite *Style*, his interlarding all with poignant and bitter Jeers, his knowledg in *Greek*, his cunning in *Topicks* (of all which those eminent Wits were perfect Judges, being qualities themselvs were excellently endow'd with) could not chuse but draw extraordinary praises from those eloquent Pens; whose Masters had not the leasure, by tedious turning over Books and deep reflections upon the occasion of the cited places, to ponder the weight of the proofs, or see thorow the malice of the Project, which

was

was of no leſs pernicious conſequence, then to ſlander and diſparage the moſt glorious Perſons of the World; to blaſt the credit of all true *Vertue* and *Honour*, in their chief ſupports: to diſable the ſole Miſtreſs of good life here; and ſo, wholly to obſtruct the only way to eternal happineſs hereafter.

FINIS.